DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 946 JC 890 306

AUTHOR Kayfetz, Janet; And Others
TITLE Improving ESL Instruction for College-Bound Students. Final Report of the Project Conducted July 1, 1987 through June 30, 1988.
INSTITUTION Coastline Community Coll., Fountain Valley, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY California Community Coll. Fund for Instructional Improvement.
PUB DATE Dec 88
NOTE 84p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Bound Students; College School Cooperation; Community Colleges; Curriculum Development; *English (Second Language); Interviews; *Needs Assessment; *Second Language Learning; *Student Attitudes; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Coastline Community College CA

ABSTRACT

Results are presented from the first phase of Coastline Community College's Improving English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) Instruction for College-Bound Students project. The goal of Phase 1 was the systematic collection of information about non-native English speakers and ESL subject matter to be used in course development and outcomes measurement. In addition to a review of the literature on applied linguistics and second-language learning/teaching, Phase 1 included a needs assessment component that gathered data from two- and four-year college students and faculty in California concerning student background and performance characteristics, instructional methods and activities, and course objectives and content. The Phase 1 report includes sections on the following topics: (1) language problems of non-native English speakers and ESL courses offered; (2) the scope of all three phases of the project; (3) theories of language acquisition and language teaching; (4) the creative construction and skill-learning modules of second-language acquisition; (5) the design of a syllabus for an ESL course based on a communicative approach; and (6) the development of writing skills in ESL. The bulk of the report focuses on the methods and findings of the needs assessment. Findings are presented concerning the demographic characteristics of ESL students; the actual and expected performance of students in college-preparatory ESL courses; instructional methods, activities, and materials preferred by both students and teachers; problems related to motivation and environment; the need for video-based instructional materials in college-preparatory ESL classes; student and teacher preferences for topics in video and course materials; and the objectives, materials, and syllabi of current ESL courses. (JMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED307946

IMPROVING ESL INSTRUCTION FOR COLLEGE-BOUND STUDENTS

Final Report of the Project
Conducted July 1, 1987 through June 30, 1988

Prepared by

Janet Kayfetz
Mary Cordaro
and
Marilyn Kelly

for

The California Community Colleges
Fund for Instructional Improvement

Coastline Community College
Fountain Valley, California

December 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Purdy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 890 306

PROJECT TEAM

Leslie N. Purdy, Ed.D., Director of Alternative Learning Systems,
Project Administrator
Kenneth Yglesias, Ed.D., Associate Dean of Instruction,
Project Administrator
Marilyn Kelly, Resource Development Specialist,
Project Director
Jane Wood, Instructional Associate-ESL

PROJECT CONSULTANT

Mary Cordaro, Needs Assessment Specialist and Instructional Designer

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Janet Kayfetz, Ph.D., Director of ESL and Associate Professor,
University of California, Santa Barbara

Stephen Ross, Ph.D., Director of Interdisciplinary Program in Linguistics,
California State University, Long Beach

Linda Kuntzman, Ph.D., Director of ESL Program,
Coastline Community College

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE

Jorge Sanchez, Supervisor of District Research,
Coast Community College District

© Coast Community College District 1988

IMPROVING ESL INSTRUCTION FOR COLLEGE-BOUND STUDENTS

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of Phase 1 of the three-phase project entitled "Improving ESL Instruction for College-Bound Students" conducted by Coastline Community College with funding from the California Community Colleges Fund for Instructional Improvement. The end result of the project is the design and production of a video-based instructional system in college preparatory ESL based on the hypothesis that a carefully designed instructional system incorporating video, print, student activities, and evaluation procedures could help enhance the effectiveness of instruction for students in college preparatory ESL. Phase 1 activities included a literature review and an assessment of student learning needs and preferences to be used in the formulation of the proposed instructional system. The needs assessment involved nineteen institutions representing the three segments of California higher education: the California community colleges, the California State University, and the University of California.

INTRODUCTION

In January 1987, the California Legislative Joint Committee for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education issued its final report on "California Community College Reform." In this report, the Joint Committee observed, "By the turn of the century California will have a cultural and ethnic pluralism unknown in the mainland United States" (p. 1).

The numbers of nonnative speakers (NNSs) of English attending California schools are thus expected to increase dramatically over the next several years to reflect the general demographic increase. This increase in NNSs will have a strong influence on postsecondary education in California, since a potentially large number will be attending institutions of higher education. Because of low proficiency in college-level English language skills, many of these students will not be able to cope with the academic requirements of higher education despite the observation that many of these same students possess the intellectual skills and abilities to accomplish college-level work.

To prevent a societal split between the educated and under-educated in our state, the Joint Committee called on California colleges and universities to help NNS speakers gain the English language skills they need to do college-level work. Community colleges were asked to take the lead in this process and to work closely with California State University and the University of California to improve articulation for four-year degree-seeking ESL students.

LANGUAGE PROBLEMS OF NONNATIVE SPEAKERS AND ESL COURSES OFFERED

To compete with native speakers in college settings, NNSs must overcome various gaps in their second language development. Marianne Celce-Murcia (1987) points out that some of the most critical problems facing second-language learners are not usually problems for native speakers, specifically such basic language skills as listening comprehension ability and speaking ability. NNSs also typically have problems with grammar and vocabulary, problems which critically affect their writing proficiency. Celce-Murcia further points out a more culturally based problem for second language writers:

> Every language has a unique, preferred way of presenting information in expository writing. ESL students who are literate in their native language will thus encounter problems when adjusting to typical expository patterns in English. This will also affect the ESL students' ability to read and write (p. 2).

While there are no specific policies regarding spoken language proficiency for nonnative English-speaking students in institutions of higher education in California, there are standards for acceptable college-level writing that all matriculated students must meet for graduation. It is often this requirement, the freshman composition course (and in some cases additional writing courses

required by particular faculties) that frustrates NNSs as they find that they do not have the reading and composition skills to satisfy the course requirements.

In a report to the English Liaison Committee of the Articulation Conference, Ross, Burne, Callen, Eskey, and McKay point out that freshman composition is crucial for all students since it is the one writing course required by all post-secondary institutions. This course not only fulfills general education requirements but also prepares students to enter a specified major and helps them develop the general communication skills needed to successfully complete other college requirements.

While California colleges and universities presently offer a variety of English as a Second Language (ESL) courses designed to help NNSs gain the proficiency necessary for entrance by placement exam into the required freshmen composition course, there is much variation in course requirements and expectations. Ross and his colleagues emphasize that community colleges, CSU, and UC should work together to establish a "benchmark level" as well as a common set of criteria for evaluating ESL students who are preparing for freshman composition, and common objectives, approaches, and expectations.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: OVERVIEW OF PHASES 1, 2, AND 3

In response to the language needs of nonnative English-speaking students attending institutions of higher education in California, Coastline Community College hypothesized that a carefully designed instructional system incorporating video, print, student activities, and evaluation procedures would enhance the effectiveness of instruction in college preparatory ESL. Coastline Community College thus proposed the development of such a video-based course for ESL students preparing for freshman composition in the form of a three-phase project entitled "Improving ESL Instruction for College-Bound Students."

This current report presents the results of Phase 1. Following is a description of the goals and activities of Phase 1 and a brief description of the proposed activities for Phases 2 and 3.

PHASE 1: INFORMATION GATHERING

The goal of Phase 1 of the project is to collect information about the target audience and subject matter in a systematic way so that these data can be used to design a course that meets specific needs and produces measurable results. In addition to a literature review, a needs assessment was designed and conducted.

Literature Review. The Literature Review presents current theories of applied linguistics and second language teaching and provides a rationale for using video-based instructional materials to improve the writing skills of ESL students in pre-freshman composition courses.

Needs Assessment. The Needs Assessment presents data collected from students and faculty in all three California sectors concerning student background and performance characteristics, instructional methods and activities, course objectives, and course content. These data were gathered from surveys and interviews involving students, ESL teachers, and applied linguists. Student, faculty, and content specialist participants for Phase 1 were identified by advisory committee members and by contacts through networking with leading ESL practitioners in the state. The most important criterion for selecting schools to participate in the needs assessment was the quality of the ESL Program at the school. (Refer to pages 12 and 13.)

PHASE 2: ANALYSIS, DEMONSTRATION, AND DESIGN

Phase 2 of the project will include a thorough analysis of the needs assessment data and course information, the development and evaluation of a pilot lesson, and the application of the resulting information to the design of a video-based course. This phase will result in a "blueprint" for creating a fully integrated set of ESL instructional materials utilizing instructional video.

PHASE 3: PRODUCTION

Phase 3 is the implementation of the design developed in Phase 2. Phase 3 will include script writing and production of all video segments as well as print development for the student study guide and the faculty guide.

REPORT ON PHASE 1 INFORMATION GATHERING

LITERATURE REVIEW: THEORIES OF LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND LANGUAGE TEACHING

The underlying hypothesis of this project is that a carefully designed instructional system incorporating video, print, student activities, and evaluation procedures can help enhance the effectiveness of instruction in college preparatory ESL, specifically composition. The following summaries of current theories in second language acquisition and teaching and approaches to syllabus design will provide the basis for the position that video-based materials can provide an integrated skills approach to verbal and written instruction.

In many fields that deal with human behavior, there is often an unclear and uncomfortable relationship between theory and practice. This is definitely the case in the field of second language education. While there have been some instances in which teaching methodology was overly dependent on linguistic theory and learning theory (the audio lingual method of second language teaching, for example, grew out of structural linguistics and behaviorism), it is more often the case that no direct relationship exists between linguistic theory and language pedagogy. More often than not, teachers are left to develop course

syllabi, materials, and methods without the help of a "useful" theory of language or language learning. In recent years, however, the field of Applied Linguistics has emerged as the arbiter between theories of how people acquire second languages and teaching practice, interpreting observations about the nature of language, language learning, and language teaching in ways that are intended to be of practical use for classroom teachers and even students.

One major issue in Applied Linguistics that has recently received much attention is the relationship between structure, or form, and meaning, or function. This relationship has great significance for syllabus design and classroom teaching. Is the proper focus of linguistic description how the language is structured (form) and how the constituent parts of a language combine to form sounds, words, and sentences? Or is it how language conveys meaning through contextualized discourse (function)? Should teachers teach students grammar--the structure, or form, of language--to enable them to potentially take these grammatical building blocks and create their own phrases and sentences? Or should teachers first of all help students acquire the ability to communicate meaning in real situations, to use the language to perform some real function like requesting, apologizing, complimenting, etc.?

SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION THEORY

Second language (L2) acquisition theory focuses on how individuals master a language other than the primary language. In general terms, one can conceptualize L2 acquisition by looking at two models that capture many of the characteristics of this very complex cognitive/psychological process: 1) the creative construction model, and 2) the skill-learning model. (A more complete discussion can be found in Littlewood, 1984.)

1) The creative construction model

This model places emphasis on internal processing strategies of language learners as they develop internal, cognitive "representations" of the L2. These increasingly complex internal representations result in the predictable stages of development in the L2 observed by researchers (Kayfetz, 1982).

According to this model, production of the second language, that is, speaking and writing, is an "external expression" of this internal system, an ability which may or may not emerge during mastery of the L2. The creative construction model thus looks at internal cognitive mechanisms and the building, or the "creative construction" of an underlying knowledge of the language as being not only the crucial aspect of L2 mastery, but as being independent of language production. Following this reasoning, then, a student can have a sophisticated understanding of the L2 system without ever using the language.

Language learners are able to develop internal representations of the L2 when 1) the appropriate amount and kind of input is provided, (Krashen, 1984), and 2) the learning environment is supportive and not threatening (Dulay, Burt, and

Krashen, 1982; Stevick, 1976). These two notions, the quality of input and the characteristics of the learning environment, are critical in successful L2 acquisition and are of particular interest to this project. Language images that are comprehended by the learner, that are presented to the learner in natural, communicative situations and which are vivid and richly contextualized are more likely to be recalled and used by the learner when appropriate.

But even given optimum input, and enough of it, acquisition may not occur. In fact, it is very often the case that there is a "mismatch" between the language input students receive and the language they produce. One hypothesis extended to account for this observation is the notion that much input is blocked by barriers related to students' affect, or their emotions and feelings. These "affective filters" vary in strength according to each individual's self-esteem, motivation, attitudes toward the L2 language and culture, etc. These affective filters are "weakest," that is, they seem to block the least input, when students do not feel threatened, belittled, or bored. Thus it can be seen that there is a dynamic relationship between input and affect: the more positive, interesting and meaningful the nature of the input, the more chance it has of getting past the affective filters, and therefore the more chance it has of becoming part of the long-term memory of the student available for use when appropriate.

° Since it is inherent in the nature of well-produced video that it can be interesting, vivid, and non-threatening, video-based language materials have the potential to provide excellent input for L2 acquisition and L2 instruction.

2) The skill-learning model

While the creative construction model emphasizes internal processing of language learners, the skill-learning model looks at L2 mastery from the opposite direction. This model claims that productive activity such as drills and controlled question/answer practice leads to an internalization of the language system so that eventually the student will be able to produce the L2 without conscious thought. One can easily see that many approaches to L2 teaching implicitly rely on this language learning perspective.

The differences between the two models can be represented in the following diagram (Littlewood, 1981, p. 73).

Creative construction model:

° Input from exposure	° Internal processing	° System constructed by learners	° Spontaneous utterances

Skill-learning model (underlying most teaching):

° Input from instruction	°Productive activity	° System assimilated by learners	° Spontaneous utterances

It should be pointed out that the nature of the input in the skill-learning model is quite different from the nature of the input in the creative construction model which, as previously mentioned, assumes natural, contextualized input from the environment of the learner. The input in the skill-learning model

consists of controlled language samples selected by the teacher or textbook writer accompanied by explanations of the nature of the underlying system, or what we call "grammar explanations." The learner, then, is not "creatively constructing" or internalizing the L2 system, but is memorizing an imposed, graded sequence of constructions. While such a perspective assumes that learners are not doing any of their own creative construction, in fact this universal internal processing is happening in spite of careful attempts by teachers to control the acquisition process.

According to the skill-learning model, a language can be separated into skills and even sub-skills that can be arranged hierarchically to be practiced and mastered separately. These sub-skills are then combined into the total skill. Thus language use is regarded as a combination of tasks composed of sub-tasks, each composed of sub-tasks, and so on.

While both models have similar goals for L2 acquisition (the internalization of a set of rules used to create language for particular uses), they propose different paths to this goal, and each describes perspectives of the L2 acquisition process that make sense to language teachers, researchers, and materials developers. Aspects of each model, then, may be useful in L2 classroom teaching.

COMMUNICATIVE SYLLABUS DESIGN

The first step in implementing a theoretical approach to language learning and teaching is the development of a syllabus. The syllabus should present the goals and objectives of the course, the content, and the methods to be used. While most second language courses traditionally take a grammatical approach to the teaching of the L2 (a focus on form), recently there has been much work to suggest that a syllabus that focuses on communication of the L2 (a focus on function) more accurately reflects what we know about how second languages are remembered and produced when needed.

Munby (1978) enumerated components of a syllabus for a communicative-based course:

> the purposes for which the learners wish to acquire the L2;
>
> the settings, both physical and social, in which they will want to use the L2;
>
> the social roles of both the learners and their interlocutors;
>
> the communicative events, or specific situations, in which the learners will participate;
>
> the language functions needed in these situations, such as requesting, denying, flattering, inviting, etc.

the discourse and rhetorical skills necessary, such as the knowledge of the structure of specific genre like essays, poems, jokes, lectures, casual conversations, etc.;

the varieties of the L2 that will be needed;

the proficiency level required;

the grammatical content that will be needed;

the lexical content required.

Inclusion of these components in the syllabus reflects basic assumptions about language acquisition, language teaching, and syllabus design. Instead of deciding prior to a particular course that the proper content consists of a set of grammar rules to be memorized and manipulated, the communicative approach begins with the assumption that the course should teach the language behaviors that will actually be needed by the particular group of students and that grammatical content is only part of what the students will need to know to be able to use the L2 appropriately and competently. In a course designed in this way, then, a needs analysis is conducted before course syllabus and content are determined. One can further see that a change in any of the parameters mentioned above will affect all other parameters, so that this type of course design has by definition a flexibility that the traditional grammatical syllabus can never have.

Specifically, a communicative approach to language teaching highlights the various characteristics of language and the learning/teaching environment. A communicative approach focuses on:

The learner. Creating a course syllabus in response to learner needs reflects the belief that language is acquired more effectively when students are motivated by a real need to communicate in the L2.

The functions of language. Early proponents of a communicative approach to language such as Wilkins (1976) suggest that basic categories of meaning should constitute the essential framework of the course.

Discourse. Widdowson (1978) argues that sentences in isolation do not represent communication, but that communication takes the form of connected utterances, or discourse. Discourse is the use of sentences according to commonly known conventions of usage to help convey meaning. Discourse may take numerous oral and written forms such as personal interaction, narratives, business letters, or research reports. Widdowson claims that individuals acquire the conventions of discourse from language input and language use.

Widdowson further points out that the conventions for different forms of discourse often do not change markedly from one country to the next, and when they do, they represent cultural differences, not linguistic differences. For example, the conventions for writing a scientific report remain fairly constant across languages. If students have familiarity with the conventions of discourse in their first language, they need only modify them in the L2.

Language in context. Widdowson (1978) highlights the importance of acquiring a language as it is used naturally in particular contexts. The problem, however, is that L2 instructional materials generally present the language

> in dissociation from a real communicative purpose in contexts devised solely as a means of teaching language . . . the learner is denied the opportunity of drawing on his own experience of language. If it is the case, as I have argued here, that the learning of language means acquiring the ability to handle discourse and if this crucially depends on a knowledge of conventions, then it would seem to follow that we have to link the foreign language to be learned with real contexts of use in one way or another. One such set of contexts . . . is quite naturally provided by other subjects on the school curriculum (p.53).

Integrated skills. While presenting language in the context of academic subjects seems to be a powerful source of real language input, most often the language curriculum separates language skills into discrete packages for instruction and evaluation divorced from relevant content. We usually see separate courses in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Widdowson (1978) argues that

> Teaching of language as communication calls for an approach which brings linguistic skills and communicative abilities in close association with each other (p. 144).

The integrated skills approach assumes that students apply all their language skills to the task of understanding and transmitting messages and that, in the real world, language use involves not the separation of abilities, but their synthesis.

It is important to note that instructional material presented in a video format can easily incorporate the important characteristics of optimum input. The flexibility of video and its potential use as a springboard for group discussion, as a supplement to readings and writing assignments, and as a way of presenting real language used in real contexts makes it an ideal medium for L2 classroom materials.

DEVELOPMENT OF WRITING SKILLS IN ESL

As students prepare to do college-level writing, they must continue to acquire the language skills needed to comprehend meaning and understand ideas, to acquire the ability to convey meaning and communicate ideas, and to learn rules of use and grammar in order to attain an appropriate level of communication and to manipulate language more consciously to achieve desired results.

In Writing, Research, Theory, and Applications (1984), Krashen hypothesizes that the appropriate input for writing acquisition is reading. During the reading process, he says, the student internalizes the structure of the written language. He explains that L2 learners, however, may not read a sufficient amount in the L2 to see immediate benefits in their writing, because in addition to reading, students must practice writing to develop skills in composing.

> While studies of second language writing are sadly lacking, there is good reason to suspect that deep similarities exist between first and second language competence and performance, and that similar pedagogies are called for - reading for the acquisition of the written language, and writing practice for the development of an efficient composing process (p. 41).

To compete with native speakers in college settings, NNSs must not only overcome gaps in their general L2 development but must also acquire the register, or voice, of academic discourse, both in speaking and writing.

Carefully prepared video materials on appropriate content areas supplemented by written materials and classroom interaction can provide a strong foundation for ESL students who need to improve their L2 proficiency specifically in preparation for college-level writing courses.

CONCLUSIONS

The literature review leads the project team to recommend a communicative approach for college preparatory ESL. Such an approach would provide optimum language input from the range of discourse appropriate to college-level, academic discourse and would be carefully designed to respond to the needs of the students.

The project team proposes to develop a communicative syllabus for college preparatory ESL which grows out of the needs assessment data gathered in Phase 1 of the project. Using this syllabus, the project team will create a carefully integrated system of instructional materials. Video will be a primary component of this system along with print, student activities, and evaluation. The project team hypothesizes that video will facilitate the development of writing skills in at least the following ways. The use of video can:

provide input that is contextualized, interesting, and "real"

create a classroom atmosphere that is non-threatening and thus create potentially ideal conditions for L2 acquisition

serve as the basis for class discussion in which students can test their comprehension, analyze content, draw conclusions, and develop and practice writing skills.

In the following section of this report, we present the findings of the Needs Assessment. The data are presented along with summaries of trends observed in the responses received. In general terms, the findings suggest that the focus and direction of the project are well founded and well conceived. A detailed analysis of the data will be presented in Phase 2 of the project.

****

REPORT OF NEEDS ASSESSMENT DATA

This is the presentation of data collected in the statewide needs assessment of college preparatory ESL. In this report, "target class" refers to the ESL class that immediately precedes and prepares students for freshman composition. Nineteen postsecondary institutions participated in this study.

DATA GATHERING ACTIVITIES

The assessment consisted of the following activities:

Written Surveys. These were administered to "target class" students and faculty at each of the nineteen participating institutions. These included ten community colleges, six campuses of the California State University, and three campuses of the University of California. The results of these are presented in tables and are presented as "Student Survey" or "Faculty Survey."

Personal Interviews. Faculty and students from six institutions, two from each segment, participated in personal interviews. Students selected from the target class for these interviews were mastery, or high performing, students, and their comments are presented with the heading, "Master Student Interview." ESL faculty responses are listed as "Faculty Interview." Freshman composition instructors were asked a limited number of questions by telephone interview, and their comments are presented with the heading, "Freshman Composition Interview."

The chart on page 15 lists the participating institutions and faculty members, the number of student and faculty surveys and interviews administered, and the subject matter experts from each segment who are on the project advisory committee.

CRITERIA

The most important criterion for selecting schools for the study was the quality of the ESL program within the school. It was important to identify ESL programs that get results and that describe and measure those results. Secondary requirements included diversity of geographical location and willingness to participate. Potential participants were identified by advisory committee members and by networking with leading ESL practioners in the state. Answers to the following questions determined whether or not a school was invited to participate:

What kind of articulation is there between the ESL department and the English department in the school? We wanted only schools with fairly good articulation. We discovered that very little formal tracking is done, so we had to limit our study to those programs that do at least informal tracking.

Is the ESL program part of a postsecondary institution rather than an Extension program? We wanted only the credit program.

Is the target class made up exclusively of ESL students, or are they mixed with remedial native speakers? We chose only exclusive ESL classes.

Does the target class focus predominantly on writing, or does it combine writing with reading, listening, and speaking? Only very few had reading included in the class, and we did accept that.

How do the teachers rate their own programs? If they made positive evaluations, they were considered. If they reported problems with programs, they were not.

Were they willing to participate, were they available (dates), and were the department heads willing to ask their teachers to participate?

Are the students predominantly resident aliens or visa students? We were only interested in resident alien programs.

Is the course preparing students to do college-level writing? Adult education and basic skills were eliminated.

What size was the school and where was it located? Size was not especially a factor, although we tried to get a range of large-small; north, central, and south.

ORGANIZATION OF NEEDS ASSESSMENT DATA

The responses to the surveys and interviews are organized according to the goals of the needs assessment.

Goal 1 Identify actual and expected performance of students in college preparatory ESL classes.

Target Audience Characteristics

Expected or Mastery Performance

Actual Performance

Goal 2 Determine preferred instructional methods, activities, and materials of both teacher and students.

Preferred Methods

Materials

Teacher Effectiveness

Goal 3 Uncover non-performance problems.

Motivation

Environment

Goal 4 Determine the need for video-based instructional materials in college preparatory ESL classes.

Goal 5 Determine student and teacher topic preferences for video and course materials.

Goal 6 Gather course objectives, materials, and syllabi from current ESL courses.

Further analysis of the data will take place in Phase 2 of the project.

STATEWIDE ESL NEED ASSESSMENT PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

	School	Contact	Class	Survey Sections/ Students	Sur- vey Tchrs	Inter- viewed Teacher	Inter- viewed Students
	UC SYSTEM: Subject Matter Expert - Dr. Janet Kayfetz, UCSB						
1.	UCSB	Carol Hiles, Acting Director, ESL	Ling 3	4@24	4	Patricia Law Carol Hiles (Freshman Comp)	5
2.	UCDavis	Tippy Schwabe, Head of ESL Mary Lowry, Admin. Coordinator of Undergraduate ESL	Engl 23	4@18	4	Janet Lane	2
3.	UCI	Robin Scarcella, Head of ESL	ESL 20D	3@20	2		
	CAL STATE SYSTEM: Subject Matter Expert - Dr. Steve Ross, CSULB						
4.	CSULB	Karen Fox, Director, ALP	ALP 150	3@20	3	Tere Ross	0
5.	San Francisco State	Dan Glicksberg, Acting Head, ESL Kate Kinsella, Materials Designer	ESL 204	4@30	4	Kate Kinsella	5?
6.	Sacramento State	Robbie Ching, Coordinator, ESL	Engl 2A	5@15	5	Susan Wagman (Freshman Comp)	
7.	CSFullerton	Jackie Kiraithe, Chair, Foreign Lang. Dept.	Engl 99	4@20	4		
8.	San Diego State	Dr. Ann Johns, Dir., Acad. Skills	Acad. Skills 33	3@25	3		
9.	Cal Poly	Larry Robinson, ESL Chair (Engl. Dept.)	Engl 99	3@18	3		
	COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM: Subject Matter Expert - Linda Kuntzman, CCC						
10.	San Jose City	Mary Jane Page, Asst. Dean of Engl. Virginia Scales, ESL Coordinator	ESL 92	4@35	4	Margaret Muench	3
11.	Cerritos	Martha Yeager-Garcia, Head of ESL	ESL 4.1	4@35	2	Diane Nakamura	3
12.	Contra Costa	June Chatterjee, ESL Dept. Chair	ESL 150	1@30	1		
13.	Palomar	Janet Hafner, Coordin. Acad. ESL	ESL 3	1@30	2		
14.	OCC	Gari Browning, Head, ALP	ALP 060	4@35	4	Carol Burke-Fonte (Freshman Comp)	
15.	Long Beach City	Bernice Weiss, Chair-ESL	ESL 33B	3@25	3		
16.	Rancho Santiago	Don Brown, Chairman, Engl.Dept. Barbara Forrest, ESL Dept.	Engl 110	4@30	4		
17.	Cypress	Jewel Keusder, Head, ESL	ESL 72	3@25	1		
18.	San Francisco City	Mary Thurber, ESL Curriculum Coordinator (Dept. of English)	ESL 40	3@32	3		
19.	Saddleback	Mike Merryfield, Head, ESL Dept.	Engl 391	1@40	1		

Goal 1: Identify actual and expected performance of students in college preparatory ESL classes.

TARGET AUDIENCE CHARACTERISTICS

Summary

The following fifteen tables present the demographic target audience characteristics. These data are the result of responses to demographic questions from the student survey questionnaires. As mentioned previously, the following demographic data do not necessarily represent all ESL students within the three college segments. This data, however, can provide valuable information about students within the particular programs chosen for this study. The following are highlights of the data.

Nationality: For all three college sectors, more than half of the ESL students are from China and Vietnam. This accounts for less than one-half of community college ESL students and about two-thirds of those at Cal State and UC campuses. There is a fairly even spread within the remaining nationalities listed, with slightly more Cambodians and Hispanics at the community college level and Koreans at the UC level.

Age v. Sex: Almost two-thirds of all ESL students are 25 years of age or younger. At community colleges, however, while one-third are aged 20 to 22, 87 percent of the total ESL students are fairly evenly spread within the age group up to 35 years of age. In the Cal State segment, 85 percent are 35 years or younger, and in the UC segment, 34 percent are 25 years or younger. Among all three sectors, there is a balance of males and females, with slightly more women at community colleges and UC campuses and slightly more men at Cal State campuses.

Time in U.S.: There is no significant pattern of years spent in the U.S. among the three sectors. Students arrived in the U.S. as late as 1970 and as early as 1987. UC students tend to have resided fewer years in the U.S.

Educational Goal: Almost two-thirds of community college ESL students plan to complete four-year and/or master degrees. At Cal State campuses, 84 percent plan to complete four-year and/or master degrees, while 86 percent at UC campuses plan to complete four-year, masters, and/or doctorate degrees in medicine.

Major: The distribution of majors is significantly different between the segments. At UC campuses, 51 percent of the students are majoring in math/science. This category is negligible at

CSU and community colleges. At CSU campuses, 41 percent of the students are majoring in business/computers. The next category at CSU is engineering/design with 28 percent. At community colleges, occupational/technical career majors lead the way with 35 percent. Business/computers is next with 24 percent.

Non-U.S. Education: Over two-thirds of community college ESL students have had significantly more non-U.S. education--up to twelve years. At Cal State campuses, two-thirds have had less than eight years of non-U.S. schooling, while three-quarters of UC students have had less than eight years. About one-third of ESL students at both UC and Cal State campuses have had less than six years of schooling. It is important to note that at all three sectors, most ESL students studied English outside the U.S. two years or less, and many of these have had no previous English studies.

STUDENT SURVEY: Which best describes your ethnic/national background?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
AMERICAN INDIAN	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	1	0%
AFRICAN (BLACK)	0	0%	1	0%	4	3%	5	1%
CAMBODIAN	39	8%	12	3%	5	4%	56	6%
CARIBBEAN	2	0%	1	0%	0	0%	3	0%
EUROPEAN (WHITE)	25	5%	6	2%	1	1%	32	3%
CENTRAL AMERICA	25	5%	2	1%	1	1%	28	3%
CHINESE	100	20%	123	35%	55	43%	278	29%
FILIPINO	12	2%	7	2%	0	0%	19	2%
IRANIAN/PERSIAN	18	4%	8	2%	3	2%	29	3%
JAPANESE	16	3%	5	1%	4	3%	25	3%
KOREAN	31	6%	17	5%	15	12%	63	7%
MEXICAN	46	9%	7	2%	2	2%	55	6%
PACIFIC ISLANDER	3	1%	3	1%	0	0%	6	1%
SOUTH AMERICA	30	6%	9	3%	2	2%	41	4%
VIETNAMESE	101	21%	118	34%	29	23%	248	26%
NONE OF THE ABOVE	40	8%	29	8%	5	4%	74	8%
TOTAL	488	100%	348	100%	127	100%	983	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

STUDENT SURVEY: What is your age?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
17 OR YOUNGER	5	1%	1	0%	3	2%	9	1%
18 TO 19	84	17%	102	29%	83	63%	269	27%
20 TO 22	151	30%	134	38%	28	21%	313	32%
23 TO 25	82	16%	62	18%	7	5%	151	15%
26 TO 30	60	12%	29	8%	7	5%	96	10%
31 TO 35	57	11%	11	3%	1	1%	69	7%
36 TO 40	34	7%	10	3%	1	1%	45	5%
41 TO 50	20	4%	2	1%	1	1%	23	2%
51 TO 60	3	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3	0%
61 OR OVER	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%
TOTAL	497	100%	351	100%	131	100%	979	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

STUDENT SURVEY: Are you male or female?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
MALE	232	48%	205	59%	64	49%	501	52%
FEMALE	256	52%	145	41%	67	51%	468	48%
TOTAL	488	100%	350	100%	131	100%	969	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

STUDENT SURVEY: What is your current marital status?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
NEVER MARRIED	351	71%	315	90%	124	95%	790	81%
MARRIED	116	24%	27	8%	4	3%	147	15%
WIDOWED	3	1%	1	0%	1	1%	5	1%
DIVORCED	9	2%	3	1%	0	0%	12	1%
SEPARATED	14	3%	4	1%	2	2%	20	2%
TOTAL	493	100%	350	100%	131	100%	974	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

STUDENT SURVEY: What year did you arrive in the United States?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
1987	50	10%	26	7%	8	6%	84	9%
1986	56	11%	18	5%	4	3%	78	8%
1985	66	13%	23	7%	12	9%	101	10%
1984	50	10%	29	8%	19	15%	98	10%
1983	52	11%	29	8%	17	13%	98	10%
1982	44	9%	45	13%	14	11%	103	11%
1981	46	9%	47	13%	10	8%	103	11%
1980	39	8%	69	20%	15	12%	123	13%
1970/79	80	16%	62	18%	28	22%	170	17%
BEFORE 70	10	2%	2	1%	2	2%	14	1%
TOTAL	493	100%	350	100%	129	100%	972	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

STUDENT SURVEY: What is your annual family/household income?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
UNDER 6,000	56	11%	64	18%	17	13%	137	14%
6,001 - 12,000	81	16%	56	16%	25	19%	162	17%
12,001 - 18,000	63	13%	48	14%	13	10%	124	13%
18,001 - 24,000	41	8%	32	9%	8	6%	81	8%
24,001 - 30,000	30	6%	20	6%	6	5%	56	6%
30,001 - 48,000	51	10%	17	5%	8	6%	76	8%
48,001 - 60,000	20	4%	8	2%	3	2%	31	3%
60,001 - 90,000	13	3%	4	1%	1	1%	18	2%
90,001 AND UP	2	0%	5	1%	1	1%	8	1%
DO NOT KNOW	91	18%	62	18%	32	25%	185	19%
PREFER NOT TO ANSWER	46	9%	31	9%	16	12%	93	10%
TOTAL	494	100%	347	100%	130	100%	971	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

STUDENT SURVEY: Other than yourself, how many persons live in your household?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
NONE	18	4%	26	7%	15	12%	59	6%
ONE	55	11%	48	13%	9	7%	110	11%
TWO	91	18%	48	14%	12	9%	151	15%
THREE	90	18%	48	14%	23	18%	161	17%
FOUR	74	15%	60	17%	30	23%	164	17%
FIVE	68	14%	53	15%	17	13%	138	14%
SIX OR MORE	98	20%	70	20%	24	18%	192	20%
TOTAL	494	100%	351	100%	130	100%	975	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

STUDENT SURVEY: What is the distance from your home to class?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
LESS THAN 1 MILE	31	6%	24	7%	58	45%	113	12%
1 TO 2 MILES	68	14%	41	12%	15	12%	124	13%
3 TO 4 MILES	114	23%	43	12%	9	7%	166	17%
5 TO 6 MILES	107	22%	43	12%	7	5%	157	16%
7 TO 8 MILES	53	11%	21	6%	4	3%	78	8%
9 TO 10 MILES	42	9%	36	10%	1	1%	79	8%
OVER 10 MILES	79	16%	141	40%	35	27%	255	26%
TOTAL	494	100%	349	100%	129	100%	972	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

STUDENT SURVEY: How do you get to class?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
BUS/PUBLIC TRANS	82	17%	55	16%	4	3%	141	15%
BICYCLE	3	1%	5	1%	57	46%	65	7%
OWN CAR	389	78%	227	66%	27	22%	623	65%
CARPOOL	18	4%	27	8%	7	6%	53	6%
WALK	10	2%	32	9%	29	23%	71	7%
TOTAL	483	100%	346	100%	124	100%	953	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

STUDENT SURVEY: Which of the following best describes your current educational goal?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
SOME COLLEGE NO DEGREE	45	9%	10	3%	2	2%	57	6%
CERTIFICATE PROGRAM	20	4%	2	1%	0	0%	22	2%
2YR COLLEGE DEGREE	76	16%	9	3%	0	0%	85	9%
4YR COLLEGE DEGREE	203	42%	223	65%	64	50%	490	51%
MASTERS DEGREE	80	17%	65	19%	24	19%	169	18%
DOCTORS DEGREE IN MEDICINE	12	2%	11	3%	22	17%	45	5%
DOCTORS DEGREE (OTHER)	17	4%	10	3%	12	9%	39	4%
LAW DEGREE	2	0%	4	1%	1	1%	7	1%
PROFESSIONAL LICENSE	29	6%	11	3%	3	2%	43	4%
TOTAL	484	100%	345	100%	128	100%	957	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

STUDENT SURVEY: What is your major? If you don't have a major, what do you think your major will be?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
MATH/SCIENCES	14	3%	25	7%	67	51%	106	11%
BUSINESS/COMPUTERS	118	24%	143	41%	12	9%	273	28%
ENGINEERING/DESIGN	51	10%	100	28%	18	14%	169	17%
SOCIAL SCIENCES	15	3%	7	2%	17	13%	39	4%
HUMANITIES/ARTS	31	6%	11	3%	2	2%	44	4%
HEALTH PROFESSIONS	39	8%	18	5%	4	3%	61	6%
OCC/TECH CAREERS	172	35%	37	11%	4	3%	213	22%
OTHER/GENERAL	25	5%	9	3%	4	3%	38	4%
UNKNOWN/MISSING	32	6%	2	1%	3	2%	37	4%
TOTAL	497	100%	352	100%	131	100%	980	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL COLUMN VALID RESPONDENTS

STUDENT SURVEY: If you started your education outside the United States, how many years of school did you complete in your country of origin or earlier residence?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
LESS THAN 6 YEARS	89	18%	104	30%	40	33%	233	25%
7 TO 8 YEARS	59	12%	71	21%	27	22%	157	17%
9 TO 10 YEARS	49	10%	51	15%	24	20%	124	13%
11 TO 12 YEARS	135	28%	53	15%	10	8%	198	21%
13 TO 14 YEARS	81	17%	28	8%	11	9%	120	13%
15 OR MORE	70	14%	38	11%	9	7%	117	12%
TOTAL	483	100%	345	100%	121	100%	949	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

STUDENT SURVEY: Did you complete college outside the United States?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
YES	108	21%	45	13%	13	10%	164	17%
NO	388	79%	306	87%	118	90%	812	83%
TOTAL	494	100%	351	100%	131	100%	976	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

STUDENT SURVEY: Have you studied English in another country?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
NOT AT ALL	135	27%	136	39%	55	42%	326	34%
LESS THAN 1 YEAR	103	21%	63	18%	18	14%	184	19%
1 TO 2 YEARS	94	19%	54	15%	21	16%	169	17%
3 TO 4 YEARS	46	9%	32	9%	14	11%	92	9%
5 TO 6 YEARS	43	9%	21	6%	5	4%	69	7%
MORE THAN 6 YRS	71	14%	45	13%	17	13%	133	14%
TOTAL	492	100%	351	100%	130	100%	973	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

STUDENT SURVEY: What language are you most comfortable using?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
ARABIC	1	0%	5	2%	0	0%	6	1%
SPANISH	78	18%	7	2%	0	0%	85	10%
KOREAN	28	7%	16	5%	16	14%	60	7%
CHINESE - ANY DIALECT	75	18%	91	30%	50	43%	216	26%
VIETNAMESE	78	18%	101	33%	19	16%	199	24%
PARSI	16	4%	7	2%	3	3%	26	3%
JAPANESE	15	4%	5	2%	4	3%	24	3%
ENGLISH	43	10%	28	9%	16	14%	85	10%
OTHER	87	21%	44	15%	9	8%	140	17%
TOTAL	422	100%	302	100%	117	100%	841	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

Summary

The following tables present entry-level and exit competencies for target classes. These data are the result of responses to the faculty survey and interviews of the target class as well as freshman composition faculty interviews. In addition, students who had completed target classes commented on their own perceptions of their exit competencies.

Placement: Among all three sectors, most ESL students enter into target classes after they take placement tests. While all three sectors also place students via department referrals and college- or university-wide testing, the community colleges rely much more on these alternate placement methods, as well as counselor and instructor referrals. UC campuses have instituted standardized statewide placement testing for all entering freshman ESL students.

Entry-Level Competencies: In written surveys and in interviews, target class faculty were asked to describe which skills they expected students to have mastered before entering their classes. The most important overall responses were in reaction to the word "mastered". For most of these classes, there are no expected specific and standard entry-level skills. Teachers expect some ability to demonstrate the skills but generally did not closely agree on the skills themselves. As one teacher said, ". . . A difficult survey to answer. I'm dealing with individual students with a variety of strengths and weaknesses." For all three sectors, over one-half of teachers surveyed expect some mastery of grammar and sentence construction, punctuation and spelling, and paragraph development. In written survey comments, many teachers also listed understanding and comprehension. Faculty survey as well as interview comments frequently further specified these skills as demonstration of "simple" sentence construction and "basic" spelling, punctuation, and paragraph structure. In the survey, there were major differences between community college faculty response to "developing a point of view" and those of Cal State and UC faculty. Almost one-half of surveyed community college faculty identified mastery of "developing a point of view," while almost no Cal State faculty and no UC faculty identified this entry-level skill. For "developing an idea and supporting it with specific detail," this discrepancy also appears: Over twice as many surveyed community college faculty as Cal State and UC identified this as a necessary entry-level skill. In the next phase of this project, it will be crucial to analyze whether or not community colleges emphasize these skills less in their target classes since they're expecting students to already possess some proficiency in these areas.

Target Class Exit-Skill Mastery vs. Freshman Composition Entry-Level Skill Requirements: The goal of all target classes is to prepare students for entrance to freshman composition. It is therefore important to analyze not only those competencies necessary for successful completion of the target class but also for successful entry into freshman composition. Early general observations about this data indicate that Cal State and especially UC faculty describe in much more depth than community college faculty the more communicative skills of composition, such as organization and development. In interviews, high performing students who completed the target class gave their perceptions of their own performance. Students in all three sectors agreed on only one item: Most thought they had very good skills in "developing an idea and supporting it with specific details" after completing the target class.

At UC campuses, all target classes are geared to one standardized Subject A exam. This is not true for community colleges and Cal State universities, where each campus may have its own placement test for entrance to freshman composition. In some community colleges, there may be no required placement test. The result is that each institution's target class faculty are teaching to different tests, and, thus, different criteria. It is most important to note, however, that the schools chosen for this study have some degree of cooperation between ESL and English departments; even so, faculty from each of these departments still do not point to standardized competency lists when they speak about skill mastery.

FACULTY SURVEY: How are students placed in your class?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
SELF-REFERRAL	2	11%	1	8%	0	0%	3	8%
DEPARTMENT REFERRAL	12	63%	4	31%	2	40%	18	49%
COL/UNI WIDE TESTING	6	32%	6	46%	1	20%	13	35%
PLACEMENT TESTING	17	89%	10	77%	5	100%	32	86%
ADMISSIONS	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	1	3%
COUNSELOR REFERRAL	4	21%	2	15%	0	0%	6	16%
INSTRUCTOR REFERRAL	10	53%	3	23%	0	0%	13	35%
COUNTRY REFERRAL	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
SCHOOL REFERRAL	1	5%	1	8%	0	0%	2	5%
OTHER	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	2	5%
TOTAL	19	100%	13	100%	5	100%	37	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

FACULTY SURVEY: Which of the following skills do you expect students to have mastered before beginning your class?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
GRAMMAR AND SENTENCE CONSTRUCTION	12	71%	5	42%	3	60%	20	59%
PUNCTUATION AND SPELLING	11	65%	6	50%	4	80%	21	62%
THINKING IN ENGLISH	5	29%	6	50%	4	80%	15	44%
VOCABULARY	6	35%	4	33%	0	0%	10	29%
DEVELOPING A POINT OF VIEW	8	47%	1	8%	0	0%	9	26%
USING IDIOMS	4	24%	1	8%	0	0%	5	15%
PARAGRAPH DEVELOPMENT	13	76%	6	50%	3	60%	22	65%
DEVELOPING IDEAS	9	53%	2	17%	1	20%	12	35%
CHOOSING STYLE/FORMALITY	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%
OTHER	1	6%	2	17%	1	20%	4	12%
TOTAL	17	100%	12	100%	5	100%	34	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

EXPECTED PERFORMANCE

FACULTY INTERVIEW: Which of the following skills do you expect students to have mastered before entering your class?

	Community Colleges	California State University	University of California
Grammar & Sentence Construction	-verb tenses and simple structures -very basic	-should be strong in constructing simple sentences -some knowledge of simple structures	-simple sentences, word forms, sentences with more than one clause joined by subordinating word combining sentences; strong in constructing simple sentences -fair, understandable level
Punctuation & Spelling	-punctuation for statements and questions; spelling up to 4th and 5th grade level -basic punctuation--hyphens too advanced; no expectations for spelling	-simple spelling and punctuation -proficiency in punctuation--follows as part of good paragraph development	-some idea of punctuation and spelling, but majority need help -already coming in with more than adequate skills here
Thinking in English	-to be able to converse in English without translating, and to comprehend lectures; ok to translate for refinement -yes, do expect this	-so-so ability -don't expect much ability	-should be able to think directly in English without the need for translating -should not be translating
Vocabulary	-6th grade level -can't quantify this; don't know what level they should be	-still need help -some simple knowledge expected	-don't expect proficiency -fair to good--extensive slang/idiomatic vocabulary
Developing a Point of View	-no expectations -no expectations	-many still need to develop this -no expectations	-minimal skills -don't expect skills in this
Using Idioms	-some degree of proficiency -no expectations	-so-so -no expectations	-minimal skills -to some extent--the more widely used idioms
Paragraph Development	-100 word, logical paragraphs; should know the main parts and one general structure -basic structure of the paragraph	-should be very strong, if not mastered -no expectations	-proficiency not expected -they have a sense, but very minimal
Developing an Idea Supporting with Details	-do have knowledge, but not mastered -yes, some proficiency expected	-still an overall problem for everyone -no expectations	-no expectations -minimal ability
Choosing Correct Style or Level of Formality	-level of proficiency expected -no expectations	-yes, they seem to know the appropriate style to use -no expectations	-little expectations--they tend to write as if they are talking on paper -pretty good here, but they still make errors because of lack of vocabulary

Target Class Exit Skills vs. Freshman Composition Entrance Skill Requirements

For each of the six campuses studied, the following data compare required exit skills for the target class with required entrance skills for freshman composition. The purpose of this comparison is to first determine if there is a close match between these exit and entrance requirements. Secondly, this information will be valuable in setting design criteria for the video-based materials and course.

SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE

Target Class Exit Requirements

Given an assigned task or question, write an essay in class that demonstrates the following:

Paragraph development.

Clear development of an in-depth main idea supported by specific details and examples.

Appropriately and thoughtfully answers the question.

A range of sentence structures.

Organization.

Facility with the language.

Grammatical correctness. (Errors that do not obscure meaning are permissible.)

Grading is based on the NTE Core Battery/PPST Scoring Guide.

Freshman Composition Entry-Level Requirements

At least a C grade in target class or score 85-100 on the Michigan Placement Test

Interview with faculty member
Write at least a high school level essay of four paragraphs that demonstrates the following:

Thesis statement.

Topic sentence.

No sentence fragments.

Acceptable spelling and punctuation.

CERRITOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Target Class Exit Requirements

Given a choice of three topics, write a 150-200 word essay within 50 minutes that demonstrates the following:

Few grammatical mistakes in a variety of constructions.

Consistently successful use of a variety of complex sentences, compound sentences, and connectives.

Vocabulary adequate for intended meaning with some idiomatic impression. Occasional errors in spelling, word form, word choice, and/or usage. No consistent patterns of errors in any one area.

Consistent development of ideas; general fluency but with occasional awkward or imprecise expression.

Freshman Composition Entry-Level Requirements

Criteria for freshman composition entry are the following:

Students able to perform well on written work in the University.

Almost native speaker level. One or two minor mistakes acceptable.

Sentence structure virtually that of an educated native speaker.

Vocabulary flexible enough to allow for fluency with idiomatic precision. No problems in spelling, word form, word choice, or usage patterns.

Good logical development; very high degree of fluency. Composition is relevant and precise.

CSU LONG BEACH

Target Class Exit Requirements

Given an assigned reading and question with one week to review before the test, write a five-paragraph final essay with 45 minutes in class that scores at least a "6" and demonstrates the following:

Correct complex sentences using a variety of structures such as prepositional, infinitive, and participle phrases, adverbial, adjective, and noun clauses.

Organization of ideas into well developed introductory, developmental, and concluding paragraphs.

Clarified viewpoint.

Main idea supported by specific details and topics.

Grammatical correctness. (Errors that do not obscure meaning are permissible.)

Answer to the question.

Utilizing several elements of punctuation and indirect speech, colon, and semi-colon.

Freshman Composition Entry-Level Requirements

English Placement score of 145 or better or passing target class.

Same essay as Final Exam for target class with C grade or better.

SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY

Target Class Exit Requirements

Given several readings and a question, write an essay outside of class that demonstrates the following:

Correct interpretation of the question.

Clear controlling idea with substantive supportive evidence from the readings.

Transitional expressions and cohesive devices.

Critique and synthesis of readings' content.

Unity and progression.

Given a short essay and question, write an essay in class that demonstrates the following:

Organization: Introduction, thesis statement, content to support thesis, conclusion.

Cohesive devices.

Vocabulary improvement and skill in deriving vocabulary meaning from context.

Good editing.

Rhetorical correctness.

Determining main ideas from the readings.

Freshman Composition Entry-Level Requirements

50 or above on the ESL Placement Test or at least a "C" grade in target class

UC SANTA BARBARA

Target Class Exit Requirements

ESL Rubric score of "6" or higher on the Subject A Exam, (See Appendix), "The 1987 Universitywide Subject A Examination" or ESL teacher recommendation to the English Department.

Given a reading passage (similar to Subject A's), write a coherent essay of several paragraphs with minimal grammatical problems that demonstrates most of the following:

Thoughtful response to the topic.

Formulation of a thesis.

Appropriate use of supporting detail and concrete examples.

Clear organization and development of ideas.

Good use of vocabulary.

Control of syntax and sentence structure (non-fragmented sentences).

Degree of creativity within the conventions of written English.

Conclusion of essay.

Point of view.

Transitions between paragraphs and ideas.

Appropriate register.

Coherence between sentences.

Grammatical and structural accuracy.

Freshman Composition Entry-Level Requirements

Rubric score of "7" or higher on Subject A Exam.

UC DAVIS

Target Class Exit Requirements

Given a previously read and discussed reading passage, write at least a five paragraph essay in a two-hour class session that demonstrates the following:

Organization

A thesis statement that clearly addresses the question.

An introduction with some attempt to lead into the thesis.

A conclusion that preferably does more than just restate the thesis.

Three clear paragraph topics that support the thesis.

Transitions between paragraphs.

Development

Paragraphs should be generally well-focused. Analysis should develop from paragraph topic, although the writer may veer slightly off topic in several paragraphs or seriously off topic in one.

Body paragraphs should contain specific and appropriate support from the reading passage.

Argumentation should be mostly logical.

Sentence

Writer should use a variety of sentence types including many complex sentences (although not all complex sentences will be totally correct).

Although there may be some errors in verb tense, the writer shows an understanding of time consistency (sequence of tenses).

Verb forms should be generally correct, although there may be some errors in form and agreement.

There should be few, if any, colloquial and/or slang expressions.

Word choice should be generally appropriate.

UC DAVIS

Target Class Exit Requirements (continued)

Word forms should be correct in most cases.

There should be few, if any, serious punctuation errors (fragments and run-ons).

Predication errors do not impede overall understanding of essay.

There should be few problems with passive voice or parallelism.

Freshman Composition Entry-Level Requirements

Same as requirements for passing Subject A. Also, same as requirements for high grades in target class. UC Davis Subject A Scoring Guide gives the following description of passing characteristics typical of passing Subject A papers:

Within two hours of reading and writing,:
"A 4 [C] paper is satisfactory, sometimes marginally so. It presents an adequate analysis of or response to the text, elaborating that response with sufficient examples and acceptable reasoning. Just as these examples and this reasoning will ordinarily be less developed than those in 5 [B] papers, so will the 4 paper's style be less effective. Nevertheless, a 4 paper shows that its writer can usually choose words of sufficient precision, control sentences of reasonable variety, and observe the conventions of written English."

FRESHMAN COMPOSITION FACULTY INTERVIEW: Entry Skill Requirements

The following are general comments by freshman composition teachers in response to an informal phone interview. The interviewed teachers (one from each segment) are experienced in teaching regular, mainstreamed, and ESL sections of freshman composition. The teachers described general entry-level competencies for ESL students.

CC	Knowledge and application of language structures, including complex and compound sentences. Grammatical fluency. Forms of language use. A level of proficiency (but not 100 percent) in various uses of form to get a point across, including argumentation and persuasion.
CSU	Ability to formulate a thesis. Ability to discriminate between the narrative form (which is organized chronologically) and the expository form (which is organized around a central point). Understanding of the essay as a genre--that the academic essay has a certain format. Uses basic punctuation, demonstrating that they understand sentence boundaries, no fragments, or run-on sentences.
UC	Competencies are the same as those for native speakers. Command of the sentence and paragraph, a general sense of essay structure, and ability to write a basic essay. Ability to recognize a topic sentence and to develop it with supporting ideas and details. For ESL students, no errors in fragments, run-ons, or incomplete sentences. Some problems with articles and verbs expected.

MASTERY STUDENT INTERVIEW: How would you rate your ability in each of the following areas of writing in English?

TOTAL

	Perceptions of Performance			Perceptions of Importance		
	High	Med	Low	High	Med	Low
a. Grammar and sentence construction	18%	65%	17%	82%	6%	12%
b. Punctuation and spelling	41%	35%	24%	76%	0%	24%
c. Thinking in English	47%	29%	24%	100%	0%	0%
d. Organizing what you want to write	29%	53%	18%	76%	6%	18%
e. Vocabulary	6%	41%	53%	100%	0%	0%
f. Developing a point of view	53%	35%	12%	94%	6%	0%
g. Using idioms	6%	23%	71%	47%	0%	53%
h. Paragraph development	41%	47%	12%	94%	0%	6%
i. Developing an idea and supporting it with specific details	65%	12%	23%	100%	0%	0%
j. Having an idea to write about	35%	47%	18%	100%	0%	0%
k. Choosing the correct style or level of formality	18%	47%	35%	94%	6%	0%

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

	Perceptions of Performance			Perceptions of Importance		
	High	Med	Low	High	Med	Low
a.	0%	100%	0%	60%	20%	20%
b.	40%	20%	40%	80%	0%	20%
c.	20%	60%	20%	100%	0%	0%
d.	60%	20%	20%	80%	0%	20%
e.	20%	60%	20%	100%	0%	0%
f.	80%	20%	0%	100%	0%	0%
g.	0%	20%	80%	40%	0%	60%
h.	80%	20%	0%	80%	0%	20%
i.	60%	20%	20%	100%	0%	0%
j.	80%	0%	20%	100%	0%	0%
k.	20%	20%	60%	100%	0%	0%

STATE UNIVERSITIES

	Perceptions of Performance			Perceptions of Importance		
	High	Med	Low	High	Med	Low
a.	20%	40%	40%	100%	0%	0%
b.	60%	20%	20%	100%	0%	0%
c.	20%	40%	40%	100%	0%	0%
d.	20%	80%	0%	100%	0%	0%
e.	0%	40%	60%	100%	0%	0%
f.	20%	40%	40%	100%	0%	0%
g.	0%	20%	80%	40%	0%	60%
h.	40%	60%	0%	100%	0%	0%
i.	60%	0%	40%	100%	0%	0%
j.	0%	80%	20%	100%	0%	0%
k.	20%	60%	20%	80%	20%	0%

U. C. UNIVERSITIES

	Perceptions of Performance			Perceptions of Importance		
	High	Med	Low	High	Med	Low
a.	29%	57%	14%	86%	0%	14%
b.	29%	43%	14%	71%	0%	29%
c.	86%	0%	14%	100%	0%	0%
d.	14%	57%	29%	57%	14%	29%
e.	0%	29%	71%	86%	0%	14%
f.	43%	43%	14%	100%	0%	0%
g.	14%	29%	57%	43%	14%	43%
h.	14%	57%	29%	100%	0%	0%
i.	71%	15%	14%	100%	0%	0%
j.	29%	57%	14%	100%	0%	0%
k.	14%	57%	29%	100%	0%	0%

Summary

The following tables and comments present information and data on actual overall performance of ESL students in target and freshman composition classes. During the analysis and design phase, the project team will compare expected or mastery performance with actual performance to determine the performance deficiencies.

Entry-Level Problems: Approximately one-half to over three-quarters of target class faculty from all three sectors generally agreed that students begin their classes with deficiencies in "grammar and sentence constructions," "developing a point of view," "vocabulary," "paragraph development," and "choosing the correct level of formality." During interviews, teachers from all three sectors in both target and freshman composition courses tied culture to problems with "developing a point of view" and "developing an idea and supporting it with specific details". As one teacher said, "Many need to develop this because it's not necessary to develop this in their own cultures." Community college and Cal State faculty, however, are much less satisfied with entry punctuation and vocabulary skills than UC. The biggest discrepancy is "thinking in English," which appears to be a fairly major problem in community college and Cal State programs but not in those at UC. In the survey, approximately one-half of students themselves from all three sectors were in general agreement about only two entry-level problem areas: grammar and sentence construction, and vocabulary. When asked in the survey if they felt they had mastered any skills upon entering the target class, answers varied widely, with no significant agreement, although the highest numbers of responses were from UC students, of whom well over one-third perceived mastery in "thinking in English".

Problem Causes: When asked the causes of problems where they see little or no improvement, teachers among the three sectors surveyed and interviewed agreed on very little. In the survey, they generally agreed only that students do not devote enough time to assignments. During interviews, many teachers attributed this to lack of time rather than irresponsible behavior or lack of motivation, since many ESL students have jobs, family responsibilities, and course overloads. Over one-half of only community college faculty, however, reported that class size is too big. Over one-half of community college and Cal State faculty also reported that students cannot read analytically. Many more Cal State and UC than community college faculty agreed that the target course is too short. UC faculty by far outnumbered the other two sectors by responding that students demonstrate a lack of critical thinking skills.

Major Improvements: Faculty survey responses on observations of major student improvements in performance differed somewhat, with some overlap. At least 80 percent of community college and UC faculty observed improvements in "grammar and sentence construction". Over 80 percent of all community college and Cal State faculty agreed that students had improved in "paragraph development" as well as "developing an idea and supporting it with specific details." Two-thirds of UC faculty also observed that students improved in "developing a point of view" and "developing an idea and supporting it with specific details." All those interviewed agreed that they saw major improvements in "developing an idea and supporting it with specific detail", "developing a point of view", and "paragraph development". One community college teacher's explanation for these improvements was that, unlike grammar rules which change, there is a logic to development skills that is ". . . easy to get and to see."

FRESHMAN COMPOSITION FACULTY INTERVIEW: Entrance Deficiencies

The following are general comments by the freshman composition teachers during informal phone interviews. Teachers described general skill deficiencies of ESL students who enter freshman composition classes and are not able to successfully complete the course.

CC — Problems with point of view and the ability to take a position and support it with details. Have difficulty applying grammatical structures within a long composition. They know how to do this, but they have trouble with application. They need more practice.

CSU — Do not understand the structure of the essay. Cannot discriminate the narrative from the expository form. Tend to write inductively rather than deductively. Cannot formulate a thesis. Students can't manage sentence boundaries and have difficulties with the punctuation and spelling which seriously undermine their writing ability.

UC — ESL program doing a very good job preparing them for this class. Because they are more recently (approximately just five years) coming to the U.S. without composition competencies in their own language, they need to make a bigger leap. Now, more are coming to U.C. without written mastery in their own language, then they go to high school in U.S. and get grammar-based work only. In high schools, they do not deal with point of view and developing ideas in ESL classes. They do little writing. Everything is new to them--not only a new language but writing in a language, period.

Originally, the project team planned to access completion rates and scores of students within ESL programs as they moved from the target class to freshman composition. Because institutions generally do not track individual ESL students and also because the programs and courses themselves are in great flux, this approach was abandoned.

FACULTY SURVEY: Which of the following are problem areas for your students when they begin your class?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
GRAMMAR AND SENTENCE CONSTRUCTION	16	84%	12	92%	4	80%	32	86%
PUNCTUATION AND SPELLING	13	68%	9	69%	1	20%	23	62%
THINKING IN ENGLISH	11	58%	11	85%	0	0%	22	59%
VOCABULARY	10	53%	10	77%	4	80%	24	65%
DEVELOPING A POINT OF VIEW	15	79%	10	77%	4	80%	29	78%
USING IDIOMS	10	53%	10	77%	1	20%	21	57%
PARAGRAPH DEVELOPMENT	11	58%	11	85%	3	60%	25	68%
DEVELOPING IDEAS	16	84%	12	92%	5	100%	33	89%
CHOOSING STYLE/FORMALITY	12	63%	7	54%	4	80%	23	62%
OTHER	2	11%	4	31%	1	20%	7	19%
TOTAL	19	100%	13	100%	5	100%	37	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

ACTUAL PERFORMANCE

FACULTY INTERVIEW: Which of the following are problem areas for your students when they begin your class? (Describe situations, examples. Discuss causes.)

	COMMUNITY COLLEGES	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Grammar and Sentence Construction	-Sometimes students are entering with less than basic skills. Even the top students make mistakes. Verb errors are the biggest problem. Large gaps exist between differenct courses leading up to this one.	-	-Definitely a problem. -Problems with complex sentence construction, verb tense, and word forms. -Problems recognizing errors while editing their work.
Punctuation and Spelling	-	-These are the least of my worries. -Commas can be a problem, but this is tied in with problems in sentence construction.	-Problems with punctuation have to do mainly with sentence boundary, fragments, and run-ons.
Vocabulary	-	-Vocabulary is very limited.	-They don't have enough of a vocabulary, and they often choose inappropriate words. Vocabulary building skills and finding meaning from context are deficient.
Developing a Point of View	-Very difficult, because not factual information. Many are uncomfortable with stressing opinions because of traditional backgrounds. They often say, "I don't have an opinion." -They tend to regurgitate ideas rather than give an opinion. They have trouble expressing opinions.	-Very tied to culture. Many need to develop this, because it's not necessary to do this in their own cultures.	-Have many who have a point of view but have trouble logically developing it and then backing it up. -This is the biggest problem.
Developing an Idea and Supporting with Detail	-They give the main idea but have trouble focusing and supporting only that topic sentence. Can feel insulted when asked to be clear-cut--they resist. Asians write differently--then end with the topic sentence. Latins want to tell you everything they know about a subject.	-Correlates closely with cultural reasons, as with developing a point of view. Also could be lack of knowledge and information.	-Coherence--focusing on a topic and supporting the main idea with a logical sequence of ideas. They digress and wonder. Logic is a problem, for example, cause and effect. They're not used to thinking analytically and breaking something down into its logical parts. -They have the biggest problem with this.

Note: Also see Appendix: "Differences in Teaching Writing to Native and Nonnative Speakers of English."

FACULTY SURVEY: As students progress, in which of the following areas do you observe major improvement?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
GRAMMAR AND SENTENCE CONSTRUCTION	18	84%	7	54%	4	80%	27	73%
PUNCTUATION AND SPELLING	10	53%	3	23%	0	0%	13	35%
THINKING IN ENGLISH	7	37%	2	15%	0	0%	9	24%
VOCABULARY	4	21%	4	31%	1	20%	9	24%
DEVELOPING A POINT OF VIEW	9	47%	8	48%	3	60%	18	49%
USING IDIOMS	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	1	3%
PARAGRAPH DEVELOPMENT	16	84%	11	85%	2	40%	29	78%
DEVELOPING IDEAS	16	84%	11	85%	3	60%	30	81%
CHOOSING STYLE/FORMALITY	6	32%	3	23%	2	40%	11	30%
OTHER	1	5%	2	15%	1	20%	4	11%
TOTAL	19	100%	13	100%	5	100%	37	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

FACULTY INTERVIEW: As students progress, in which of the following areas do you observe major improvement? (Describe situations, examples.)

CC

Improvements in order of greatest to least are developing an idea and supporting it with details, paragraph development, developing a point of view, and punctuation. For a relatively bright person, these skills are not that difficult because the logic is easy to get and to see. Development techniques don't change, unlike grammar rules, which do change.

In grammar and sentence construction, they use more complex structures, sentence length, and variety. In paragraph development and developing supporting ideas, they learn better manipulation, include more details, and are more focused. Their explanations are more thorough, and they expand on main points.

CSU

They improve most dramatically in developing a point of view and developing an idea and supporting it with details. But the biggest improvements are in thinking and being logical, thoughtful, and considering the relationship of ideas. This means observing facts, then making the connection between what they observe and its meaning. This makes them more aware of the world and gives them a basis for making and drawing or inferring conclusions. Can say, "I have this point of view because I have a lot of facts to back it up."

UC

The major improvements are in punctuation, developing a point of view, paragraph development, developing an idea and supporting it with specific details, and choosing the correct style or level of formality. They also show less major improvement in sentence construction. In developing a point of view, they're more able to take a stand and say why, and they feel better about it. They were never asked to do this before, and now may see relevance of this skill to other things they do. In developing an idea and supporting it, they're much more able to write more well thought out, convincing, explicit paragraphs. They become more specific and focused on a topic. Choosing the correct style or level of formality is easy--once someone tells them this, they do well quickly. They also get this from readings and from reading each other's work.

Major areas of improvement are developing a point of view, paragraph development, and developing an idea and supporting it with specific details. They also improve greatly in organization.

FACULTY SURVEY: In areas where you see little or no improvement, what may be the cause(s)?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
CANNOT READ ANALYTICALLY	10	53%	7	58%	1	20%	18	50%
COURSE TOO SHORT	7	37%	8	67%	4	80%	19	53%
STU DO NOT DEVOTE TIME	13	68%	9	75%	3	60%	25	69%
LACK OF GOOD SUPPLEMENT MATERIALS	1	5%	2	17%	0	0%	3	8%
COURSE SESSIONS TOO SHORT	5	26%	3	25%	0	0%	8	22%
NOT ENOUGH OPPTY/ASSIST OUT OF CLASS	8	42%	1	8%	2	40%	11	31%
CLASS SIZE TOO BIG	10	53%	1	8%	1	20%	12	33%
SHIFTS IN ETHNIC POPULATIONS	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	1	3%
DEMOSTRATE LACK/CRITICAL THINK SKILLS	8	42%	4	33%	3	60%	15	42%
OTHER	2	11%	1	8%	0	0%	3	8%
TOTAL	19	100%	12	100%	5	100%	36	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

FACULTY INTERVIEW: In areas where you see little or no improvement, what may be the cause(s)?

CC

All ESL writing courses could ideally be twice as long. Reading analytically is not a problem. There are significant gaps of knowledge/skills/practice between classes.

Students generally spend enough time on assignments, and materials are not lacking. They get plenty of assistance outside of class. The class size, however, is much too large. There should be no more than 15 per class, and usually the numbers are 27 to 35 per class. To some degree, in some cases, there is a lack of critical thinking skills. In addition, students are inadquately exposed to the topics they are required to read and write about.

Reading analytically is not a problem. The course could ideally be twice as long. Although students do spend enough time on assignments, they are stressed out from parental pressure to transfer and succeed, heavy course loads, and job interference. Course sessions are one hour; one and a half to two hours would be better. Students who plan to transfer do not qualify for enough tutoring outside of class. Class size is too high--sometimes up to 42 students. Students don't tend to use English outside of class on any level (speaking of writing).

CSU

Students have trouble breaking readings down analytically and synthesizing the information. Problems with logical, thoughtful consideration to the relationship of ideas and observation of facts in order to make the connection between what they observe and meaning. Inferring, drawing conclusions, and leading up to a point of view developed using evidence are all problems. The course is really not too short since the whole process for language acquisition takes time--some students need more exposure. None of the other factors are a problem here. Cultural causes, however, are important. Students have trouble because they write in the style of their homeland, which is more indirect. Robert Kaplan wrote a good article on the various styles of ethnic groups. Students may feel they'll offend the reader by being too direct, so they get to the thesis at the end of the paper. They don't focus.

FACULTY INTERVIEW: In areas where you see little or no improvement, what may be the cause(s)? (continued)

CSU

In the course, we really work on reading analytically. More time would be very helpful. Many students work full time, so although they spend a great deal of time on assignments, they may not be effective because of stress. I [teacher] developed many of my own materials, so we really don't have a shortage. Tutors are scarce, and quality is undependable. Class size is twice the size it should be. Many students come into the class without even minimal skills because they're incorrectly placed. Very poor preparation for the university. Some of these students shouldn't even be in the university yet. If they're not freshmen, they cannot qualify for basic skill courses. Some come straight from refugee camps--they have no support system at home, and parents have unrealistic expectations.

UC

Reading analytically is a very major problem, as well as making inferences, synthesizing, finding the main ideas, etc. Since the ESL program was changed, course length is no longer a problem. There is a better sequence of courses and more courses to go through. It now can take a student twice as long to get to Freshman Comp. Students may not see English as a priority. There is a lack of good supplemental materials--they are too grammar-book oriented--rules with fill-in-the-blank exercises. Very boring. Students should be looking at structure and meaning within writing samples and in the context of writing. Class size is eighteen but could be fourteen. There is a great opportunity for tutoring. Students do demonstrate a lack of critical thinking skills such as coherence, logical thinking, analytical thinking, breaking something down logically into parts. They don't focus--they digress and wander. Much of this is because of cultural writing differences.

Reading analytically is a problem. The course is too short--it needs to be more intensive, with more time for writing. The instructor needs twice as much time to work with students individually. Some students do not spend enough time on assignments. Although they have plenty of opportunity to work with tutors, some don't take it. There may be a lack of motivation. Students do demonstrate a lack of critical thinking skills.

STUDENT SURVEY: What are your three biggest problems in writing English? Circle three answers.

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
GRAMMAR/SENTENCE CONSTRUCTION	243	51%	201	60%	80	62%	524	56%
PUNCTUATION/SPELLING	134	28%	66	19%	14	11%	203	22%
THINKING IN ENGLISH	119	25%	79	23%	23	18%	221	23%
ORGANIZING WHAT I WANT TO WRITE	145	30%	111	33%	38	29%	294	31%
VOCABULARY	201	42%	131	39%	61	47%	393	42%
DEVELOPING A POINT OF VIEW	60	13%	58	18%	21	16%	140	15%
USING IDIOMS	72	15%	33	10%	14	11%	119	13%
PARAGRAPH DEVELOPMENT	58	12%	42	12%	13	10%	111	12%
DEVELOPING IDEA/SUPPORTING W/DETAILS	144	30%	108	32%	44	34%	296	31%
HAVING AN IDEA TO WRITE ABOUT	53	11%	51	15%	23	18%	127	13%
CORRECT STYLE/LEVEL OF FORMALITY	159	33%	95	28%	43	33%	297	31%
TOTAL	478	100%	337	100%	129	100%	944	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

STUDENT SURVEY: Which of the following writing skills do you feel you have mastered? You can circle more than one answer.

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
GRAMMAR/SENTENCE CONSTRUCTION	141	31%	85	28%	34	39%	260	29%
PUNCTUATION/SPELLING	111	24%	96	31%	41	35%	251	28%
THINKING IN ENGLISH	139	30%	78	24%	45	38%	262	29%
ORGANIZING WHAT I WANT TO WRITE	124	27%	81	25%	41	35%	246	27%
VOCABULARY	88	19%	47	15%	14	12%	148	16%
DEVELOPING A POINT OF VIEW	98	21%	77	24%	37	32%	212	24%
USING IDIOMS	28	6%	16	5%	6	5%	50	6%
PARAGRAGH DEVELOPMENT	95	21%	72	22%	42	36%	209	23%
DEVELOPING AN IDEA & SUPPORTING IT	84	18%	68	21%	24	21%	176	20%
HAVING AN IDEA TO WRITE ABOUT	138	30%	95	30%	41	35%	274	31%
CORRECT STYLE/FORMALITY REQUIRED	28	6%	25	8%	10	9%	63	7%
TOTAL	488	100%	322	100%	117	100%	884	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

Goal 2: Determine preferred instructional methods, activities, and materials of both teacher and students.

INSTRUCTIONAL PREFERENCES

Summary

Both faculty and students were asked to give feedback on preferred teaching methods, instructional activities, and materials such as textbooks. In face-to-face interviews and surveys, students also commented on teacher effectiveness.

Faculty Preferences: (Faculty preferences for activities and methods to be inserted.)

When asked how much time is spent correcting student papers, survey faculty responses varied widely. In community colleges (where classes tend to be larger), over 80 percent spend from ten to fifteen hours. Half of Cal State teachers spend five hours per week correcting papers, over two-thirds from ten to fifteen hours, and less than one-fifth spend up to thirty hours. The UC responses were equally spread, with one-fifth of faculty spending five, ten, fifteen, twenty, and twenty-five hours respectively.

Student Preferences: Among survey students, the only significant pattern for preferred activities and methods was in "reading and analyzing samples of writing". About one-half of community college and Cal State and almost two-thirds of UC students agreed that "reading and analyzing samples of writing" is the best way to learn writing in English. When asked if materials and books help to improve their writing, survey responses were spread fairly equally among "definitely", "often", and "sometimes". Interview comments were generally unfavorable toward textbooks, ranging from "too basic" to "too difficult". When asked if their instructors help to improve their writing, about three-fourths from all sectors responded "definitely" or "often." Interview comments from master students were highly favorable toward college and university ESL teachers, while unfavorable for high school ESL teachers.

FACULTY SURVEY: What percentage of time do you spend in class on each of the following teaching methods or activities?

Fifteen methods were listed. The question proved too complex or too confusing to generate useable data. Responses could not be analyzed and presented in tabular form. Below are written comments instructors included on the survey form.

Comments: The following are responses given to each category.

a: Reading text and Writing

CC Outside class.

CSU Outside assignments.

UC Reading generally done at home; writing about text.

b: Analyzing and Discussing Text
No comments.

c: Peer Editing

UC Critiquing; selecting best and explaining why.

d: Rewriting

CC Most is done outside of class.
Outside class.
Outside of class or in conference.

CSU Outside assignments.
Interview.

UC Mostly done at home.

e: Proccess Approach to Writing

CC Outside class.

UC I hope all of my work on writing fits into a process.

f: Discussing Grammar
No comments

g: In-class Writing

CC Included in point A.

FACULTY SURVEY: What percentage of time do you spend in class on each of the following teaching methods or activities? (continued)

h: Outside Class Writing

CC Yes, they do this, but it's not in class.
Daily.

CSU We write 10 papers outside class.

UC Explaining assignments.

i: Quizzes on Readings
No comments

j: Conferencing

CC Not done in class.
Done in written form.

CSU We meet for paper conferences 1/2 hour each per student twice each semester.

UC Out of class.
Most done out of class.

k: Group Work
No comments

l: Word Processing
No comments

m: Developing Ideas
No comments

n: Correcting Papers

CC Not clear--Do you mean by instructors or peers?
Conferencing.

o: Other
No comments

FACULTY SURVEY: How much time do you spend per week correcting students' papers outside of class?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
18 HOURS	1	8%	6	50%	1	20%	8	28%
110 HOURS	7	58%	2	17%	1	20%	10	34%
118 HOURS	3	25%	2	17%	1	20%	6	21%
120 HOURS	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	1	3%
125 HOURS	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	1	3%
130 HOURS	1	8%	2	17%	0	0%	3	10%
TOTAL	12	100%	12	100%	5	100%	29	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

Comments: The following are responses given to specific categories.

b:

CC I wish!! (4 preps.) (5 comp classes don't allow 10 hrs/ESL every week, but it's more like 8/week!) I have 35+ students in the class! Gasp!
Somewhere between 5-10 hours; depends on the week.

CSU Evaluating (In a process, student-centered approach to teaching writing, you don't "correct" ideas; you "respond" and "evaluate" ideas and writing skills. 5-10 hours per student course.

c:

CC It depends on how many writing courses taught. I usually teach 2 at Rancho Santiago, so my hours will reflect 6 units (between 10-15 hours).
Varies greatly between 10-15 hours.

f:

CC Depends on enrollment. Fall '87 - my enrollment for two classes was 70 students which would equal seven hours beginning of semester - 10 per hour; 50 students = 5 hours; mid-semester - 12 per hour.

CSU Plus in two ESL classes (40 students).

UC Depends on number of students; 15 students = c. 10 hours including conferences.

STUDENT SURVEY: In your opinion, what is the best way for you to learn writing in English? You can circle more than one answer.

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
FOLLOWING TEACHERS INSTRUCTIONS	233	47%	143	41%	38	30%	415	43%
DEVELOP IDEAS THROUGH TOPICS, READING	184	37%	133	38%	51	39%	368	38%
PRAC WRITING IN CLASS	213	43%	183	53%	53	41%	449	46%
PRAC WRITING OUTSIDE OF CLASS	171	35%	142	41%	52	40%	365	38%
PRAC WRITING USING A MICROCOMPUTER	30	6%	16	5%	10	8%	56	6%
WRITING SEVERAL DRAFTS OF COMPOSITION	93	19%	74	21%	54	42%	221	23%
ANALYZING CLASSMATES WORK	159	32%	117	34%	50	38%	326	34%
REGULAR JOURNAL WRITING	102	21%	93	27%	27	21%	222	23%
READING/ANALYZING SAMPLES OF WRITING	244	49%	172	49%	78	60%	494	51%
WORKING SEVERAL DRAFTS OF 1 COMPOSTION	116	23%	109	31%	39	30%	264	27%
TOTAL	484	100%	348	100%	130	100%	972	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

MASTERY STUDENT INTERVIEW: In the last ESL class you took, What was most useful to you?

CC

Comments teacher made on my papers.
Practicing in class--discussing ideas in class, then using this to write paragraphs.
Talking about other students' essays.
Developing ideas and paragraphs from pictures--writing about ideas in class.
Analyzing the readings--helped to better understand the readings and find the main ideas.

CSU

Teacher showed how to read faster and guess the meaning from context.
Organizing what I want to write and getting more interested in reading.
To compose a paragraph and to have ideas, rather than grammar.
Writing assignments, practicing grammatical patterns, developing paragraphs, discussing in class.
Rewriting drafts and peer editing.
Organizing.
Discussing ideas in class.
Choosing the right words.
Speaking during classtime improves confidence in yourself, especially when everyone has trouble--makes you feel more secure.

STUDENT SURVEY: Are the materials and books used in class helping you to improve your writing? Circle one answer.

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
DEFINITELY	160	34%	97	28%	18	14%	275	29%
OFTEN	160	34%	103	30%	40	31%	303	32%
SOMETIMES	135	28%	120	35%	54	42%	309	33%
RARELY	19	4%	20	6%	15	12%	54	6%
NEVER	3	1%	1	0%	3	2%	7	1%
TOTAL	477	100%	341	100%	130	100%	948	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

MASTERY STUDENT INTERVIEW: Are the materials and books used in class helping you to improve your writing? Why?

CC

Textbook was too basic and rarely helpful.
Textbooks too basic--knew everything.
Textbooks too difficult. Magazines are better.
All materials useful--textbooks, magazine articles, novels, and newspaper articles.
Magazine articles for getting ideas and information. Gets me interested in reading.

CSU

Some topics are hard to understand and find new ideas.
Important that teacher chooses the right book. Must be appropriate for ESL needs.
Textbooks don't have enough examples. Articles are better--I like the topics.
Articles often good--helps to learn something new, like health and different topics.
Books not very important, since teacher also says everything.

UC

Grammar book was too wordy, but reading book was good.
Grammar book was helpful, but reading book was not.
Materials sometimes helpful, but maybe you might not know enough to come on with ideas.
Articles were very helpful for style and how the writer makes ideas clear.
Not used to getting ideas from reading. Would rather know about it first.

STUDENT SURVEY: Are your instructors helping you improve your writing?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
DEFINITELY	234	49%	160	47%	54	42%	448	48%
OFTEN	150	32%	101	30%	47	36%	298	32%
SOMETIMES	75	16%	68	20%	25	19%	168	18%
RARELY	13	3%	6	2%	2	2%	21	2%
NEVER	1	0%	2	1%	1	1%	4	0%
TOTAL	473	100%	337	100%	129	100%	939	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

STUDENT INTERVIEW: Are your instructors helping you improve your writing?

CC

Comments after each paper helpful. Ninety percent of what she did was helpful. ESL instructors in general have been good.
Teacher should talk about style more and using idioms.
I learn from other students' questions. All ESL teachers have been good, but sometimes they stick too closely to the textbook and are inflexible.
Classtime is too short--could use more individual help from the teacher.
Much better than high school. Very little writing in high school.
Teacher is definitely helpful.

CSU

Teacher definitely helpful.
Teacher was especially good.
Teacher was most helpful individually.
She writes many comments on papers and gives good feedback.

UC

College ESL teachers are definitely helpful--high school ESL teachers were too basic--mostly grammar and oral.
College and high school ESL teachers have all been good. Had writing in high school, too.
Teachers good here at UC only.
Teacher helped me put ideas together.
Has helped to be careful with grammar and to choose the right words.
Not enough group discussion.

Goal 3: Uncover non-performance problems.

ENVIRONMENT AND MOTIVATION

Summary

The following table represents responses from teachers on environmental and motivational factors. Although these factors may affect performance, they are isolated from performance problems in order to avoid applying "performance" (or instructional) solutions to those "non-performance" problems.

Faculty Perceptions: When asked which environmental or motivational factors affect their students' performance, teachers gave widely varying responses. Over 80 percent of community college and 100% of UC faculty agreed, however, that "students are overloaded with work in other courses." Less than one-half of Cal State faculty responded similarly. (See also Problem Causes, page 39a.) Over two-thirds of Cal State faculty perceive that ESL "students do not value the importance of writing and using English", and over one-half responded that students do not understand why the university expects certain writing standards "and so resist assignments . . .", as well as "students are embarrassed to reveal weaknesses or shy about appearing different." Almost two-thirds of UC faculty also identified that "students feel insulted when required to take ESL courses," and "students have not had good experiences in previous ESL courses."

When interviewed, teachers commented on the general enthusiasm and hard-working attitudes of their ESL students. They commented that embarrassment can be stemming from previous ESL high school success where writing was not a high priority. Freshman composition teachers were interviewed on the environmental effects of mainstreaming. Both Cal State and UC freshman composition teachers prefer ESL sections, while the community college teachers preferred a mainstreamed classroom that is two-thirds native speakers.

Student Perceptions: When surveyed on motivation, students had widely varying responses. Almost half of community college and two-thirds of UC students identified, however, that "the skills I learn in this [target] class are important for my overall university education." Approximately one-half from all three sectors felt that the skills are important for their "everyday life" and for their "future". About two-thirds of UC students felt that the target class was important because it was required. Less than one-quarter of all students felt that the target class was important for their major.

FACULTY SURVEY: Which of the following factors affect your students' performance?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
I FEEL INSULTED	4	22%	3	23%	3	60%	10	28%
I DO NOT VALUE	5	28%	9	69%	1	20%	15	42%
I DO NOT UNDERSTAND WHY	7	39%	7	54%	2	40%	16	44%
I ARE OVERLOADED	15	83%	6	46%	5	100%	26	72%
I EXPERIENCE FAMILY PRESSURE	3	17%	4	31%	1	20%	8	22%
I ARE EMBRASSED	7	39%	7	54%	1	20%	15	42%
I HAVE NOT HAD GOOD EXPERIENCES	4	22%	3	23%	3	60%	10	28%
I DO NOT BELIEVE	5	28%	4	31%	1	20%	10	28%
I OTHER	4	22%	1	8%	2	40%	7	19%
I TOTAL	18	100%	13	100%	5	100%	36	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

FACULTY INTERVIEW: Which of the following factors affect your students' performance?

CC

Students do value the importance of writing and using English. To some degree, they also may resist assignments/techniques designed to reach standards that they feel are unreasonable. They can feel a sense of hopelessness and unfairness. They are definitely embarrassed to reveal differences. Mostly, they are overloaded with job and family obligations and pushing too hard. Yet they spend adequate time on the work. Stress is a big factor, as well as discouragement.

Students do not generally feel insulted about taking ESL courses unless they excelled in high school and then were placed in the ESL program here. In class, they will laugh off embarrassment or remain silent.

CSU

Resistance is not a problem--they are always eager to do anything to help them pass the English A test. Although they are overloaded with courses, and have more pressure, they are used to working hard and are eager. They do experience family pressure to excel, as well as pressure to excel in English. Transfer students and those from high school may not have had good previous ESL experiences.

Initially, they may feel insulted, but this quickly disappears. They do value English and know they'll be discriminated against if they don't do well. Resistance can come from transfer students because junior colleges may not adequately prepare them. They're placed much lower here than they would be in a junior college. Students are overloaded, but this does not mean they don't spend enough time on the work. They just have too much to do in general. Every class takes twice as much time as for a native speaker. They also may have poor study habits. Students experience family pressure to excel in school. Parents radically underestimate how difficult it is. Self-image is already battered--they're highly aware they're not in the norm. They may be afraid to talk in class because they're afraid the teacher will be impatient, which they may have experienced in a number of other ESL classes. May have had bad experiences, especially from high schools and junior highs, where teachers who have had no ESL training are angry. They may not believe that English is worthwhile to study, which is thinking from their parents. Asians tend to be better in non-verbal areas. Parents pressure them to be accountants, etc. Students feel overwhelmed because it seems endless, to get through the time it takes to learn it all. In low-income families, there is often no privacy and lots of family responsibilities.

FACULTY INTERVIEW: Which of the following factors affect your students' performance? (continued)

UC

Some feel insulted if they come from high school and don't understand why they're being placed in ESL. They don't want to be singled out. This goes away very quickly. Because of math and science goals, they may have a lack of perspective on what skills they'll need in the future. They want to get going in their majors--many take up to 19 [quarter] units. Sometimes they're able to do only barely passing work. Even if previous ESL experiences have not been great, most perceive that they've had good experiences. Their level of confidence is low. Many don't like to write and use English because they don't feel they're good at it. Better at math, sciences.

At the beginning of the quarter, there is resistance, but it is the teacher's role to help them overcome this resistance. May have gotten straight A's in high school in English, then when they have to go to ESL classes, they feel very let down. The more science-oriented students don't understand why the university expects certain standards. Students do not integrate enough with American students, and so they are insecure, and this affects their fluency. If class were graded rather than pass/no pass, they may be more motivated, because it would affect their GPA.

FRESHMAN COMPOSITION FACULTY INTERVIEW: Comments on Mainstreaming

The following are general comments by freshman composition teachers during informal phone interviews. Teachers described pros and cons of mainstreamed freshman composition classes.

CC ESL students need to develop fluency in both speaking and writing, so it is important that they are mainstreamed at this level. However, prefer only one-third native speakers to two-thirds nonnative. In a class with too many native speakers, ESL students may feel inferior in speaking ability. At the same time, however, ESL students feel frustrated in mainly native speaker classes because they are looking for more advanced vocabulary use and sophistication.

CSU ESL students should have their own freshman composition sections. ESL sections of freshman composition should be more process oriented, while native speaker classes focus more on writing skills. The needs of ESL students are different from native speakers. If mainstreamed, ESL students would have very serious grammar problems. There are also gaps in terms of understanding the material, such as with plays on words and idioms. All of this is too much for a freshman composition teacher to deal with, in addition to teaching the native speaker. ESL students also need a focus on self-editing and proofing.

UC The advantage of mainstreaming is higher fluency and command of English at a faster rate. But although they absorb and catch on more quickly, they tend not to think things out fully and focus less on meaning--as a result, writing can be vacuous. In ESL classes, they don't get as much done at first, but they choose each word with more care. They work slower and think things through with deliberateness. But once they get going, they do catch up and work faster.

STUDENT SURVEY: Why is this ESL class important to you? You can circle more than one answer.

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
CLASS IS REQUIRED	175	36%	166	49%	83	65%	424	44%
SKILLS IMPORTANT FOR MY MAJOR	138	28%	67	20%	26	20%	231	24%
SKILLS IMPORTANT FOR MY UNIVER ED	231	48%	213	62%	80	63%	524	55%
SKILLS IMPORTANT FOR MY FUTURE	279	58%	177	52%	59	46%	515	54%
SKILLS IMPORTANT FOR EVERYDAY LIFE	298	61%	180	53%	52	41%	530	56%
TOTAL	485	100%	341	100%	128	100%	954	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

MASTERY STUDENT INTERVIEW: Why is this ESL class important to you?

CC

I'm not going to be a writer, so it's not critical but would like to have the skills. For my everyday life, speaking is more important.

I live here, so I need to improve my English writing. I need to learn to write faster.

Very important. When you're in the U.S., speaking and writing are important for the job, and to be someone in life, and to survive. Other [non-ESL] teachers ignore how well I write. They only want to know content.

Very, very important. We live in this country, and we need to write for different people and go to different offices.

Very important--I live here, and I need to know how to communicate.

Expressing ideas in a new language is important and challenging--learning something new.

CSU

Very important for school and for work.

Very important. I'm living in the U.S., and my career depends on how well I do.

Very important. I need to improve my English and writing skills. Want to do well in this country--want to achieve.

Writing is needed in every area of your life--work and professional.

UC

Very important to get a job, for school, for communication.

Very important. In the future, will write letters for career and will have to read to find main ideas, then respond. Must use good English skills to give the right impression.

Very important--that's how you communicate.

I guess it's important for my major--in accounting, you have to write reports. In the university, you must write to pass classes. But necessary wherever you go--in and out of the university.

For my overall university education, sometimes important, sometimes not. Communication in writing is much more important than speaking.

For my future, sometimes will be important, sometimes not. Writing in English is very, very important. Not my choice to come here, but now that I'm here, it's my choice to learn a new language. If I do, it will be a benefit for me.

Goal 4: Determine the need for video-based instructional materials in college preparatory ESL classes.

NEED FOR VIDEO-BASED MATERIALS

Summary

Faculty and students responded to both survey and interview questions on whether video would be useful in the ESL classroom to develop ideas for writing and clarifying a point of view. In face-to-face interviews, teachers were also asked to discuss whether they have used video in their ESL writing classes.

Faculty Comments: Faculty survey responses on the usefulness of video for ESL target classes were generally favorable. Just under two-thirds of community college faculty responded that it would be "definitely" or "often" useful, while over one-fourth responded that it would "sometimes" be useful. About two-thirds of Cal State and UC faculty responded that it would "sometimes" be useful, and about one-fifth responded that it would be "definitely" useful. A total of 83 percent across all sectors perceive video as either "definitely", "often", or "sometimes" useful. Faculty interviewed were especially enthusiastic about using video as an alternative and supplement to reading for providing larger quantities of input and content. Two out of the six teachers interviewed sometimes use video for classroom activities. Reasons for not using video include lack of time to find suitable material that is geared for nonnative speakers.

Student Comments: At least half of students surveyed across all three sectors responded that video would be "definitely" or "often" helpful. Community college responses were slightly higher--about two-thirds. Approximately one-third of all students responded that it would "sometimes" be useful. When interviewed, mastery students were very enthusiastic, commenting that " . . . If you can see the idea you can easily get it", ". . . You watch and you get ideas", and ". . . Easier to get ideas from video than from reading." During the next phase of this project, the analysis will determine how video writing assignments can provide more practice in developing ideas for writing and clarifying a point of view and thus serve as a stepping stone to using those same skills in reading/writing assignments.

FACULTY SURVEY: Would short videos segment on interesting topics be helpful to your students for developing ideas for writing and clarifying a point of view?

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
DEFINITELY	8	44%	2	17%	1	20%	11	31%
OFTEN	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3	9%
SOMETIMES	5	28%	7	58%	3	60%	15	43%
RARELY	2	11%	3	25%	1	20%	6	17%
TOTAL	18	100%	12	100%	5	100%	35	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

FACULTY INTERVIEW: Would short video segments on interesting topics be helpful to your students for developing ideas for writing and clarifying a point of view? Why?

CC

Definitely--as an alternative to reading. Much quicker to get content, plus students would not be burdened by understanding the reading to get ideas for writing.

Would be very useful in the one-hour working lab. Perfect assignment for variety.

CSU

They love TV--it's great for their English--easier to comprehend than reading and good to present information on current topics. Good idea for general ed. topics.

Great idea--they're very visually oriented.

UC

Would want to see in conjunction with readings--would give them a lot more material. Great alternative, for variety--also good for the instructor because it takes you teachers off hook to constantly provide input.

Since already attuned to visual media, a good variation from reading. Could take some of the pressure off because it lessens pressure from reading obstacles. As long as it doesn't replace the readings. Better as a back-up. Video is more versatile because you can use parts of it for prompts, while readings must be read in their entirety.

FACULTY INTERVIEW: Do you ever use short video segments for assignments and exercises? If yes, list some.

CC

No. It takes too long to find suitable material and organize it.

No--can't find good video that is not geared for native speakers. Usually too long, not at the appropriate level, and either too complex or too simple.

CSU

Yes--used video with readings. For example, had students read the short story, "I Know Why Cagebirds Sing", then watched PBS special to reinforce ideas. Also, very good for note taking.

Yes--use films and have students write narrative on the plot, or on spin-off topics. For example, showed S.F. Foundation's documentary on AIDS. Showed "The Girl Who Spelled Freedom", and had students write the story line.

UC

No--so much to do, so little time. Overwhelming.

No--university may not respond well, and facilities are lacking.

STUDENT SURVEY: Would short video segments on interesting topics be helpful to you for developing ideas for writing and clarifying a point of view? Circle one answer.

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
DEFINITELY	167	35%	75	22%	30	24%	272	29%
OFTEN	139	29%	104	30%	40	33%	283	30%
SOMETIMES	151	31%	134	39%	37	30%	322	34%
RARELY	26	5%	31	9%	16	13%	73	8%
NEVER	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%
TOTAL	484	100%	344	100%	123	100%	951	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

MASTERY STUDENT INTERVIEW: Would short video segments on interesting topics be helpful to you for developing ideas for writing and clarifying a point of view? Why?

CC

Could be particularly helpful for people new in college.
Once a week would be good.
Should be mixed in with other materials. Too much reading is boring.
Even when you watch TV, you catch more--it's interesting and exciting and can help to give you more ideas. Good to get vocabulary and how they express ideas.
If you can see the idea, you can easily get it.
Would be very helpful. Would help to take notes while watching. Also, gives another opportunity to get ideas. People get ideas in different ways.

CSU

Easier to get the idea. The ideas and information will make you comfortable. You won't have to waste time looking for the information or thinking about it.
Would like it sometimes if video is good and if topics are easy to understand or familiar.
Action helps. I get lost in the reading and can lose the idea.
You watch and you get ideas. Might be confusing if too many new words. Pictures help.
Could help me come up with more ideas.

UC

Would definitely help in analytical skills.
Readings are better. Video goes by too fast. Better to have reading in front of you to take notes from.
Sometimes, as long as it's interesting and simple.
Definitely would help. Sometimes you just have no idea where to start.
Sometimes, combined with reading. Easier to get ideas from video than from reading.

Goal 6: Determine student and teacher topic preferences for video and course materials.

TOPIC PREFERENCES

Summary

The following tables and comments represent student and faculty responses to the surveys and interviews concerning subject matter preferences. During the analysis and design phases of the project, these preferences will be considered in the choice of topics for the video-based materials.

Student Perceptions: Students were both surveyed and interviewed for topics they find most interesting. Two-thirds of community college and Cal State students and three-quarters of the UC students surveyed identified "personal experiences" as an interesting topic for writing assignments. Under one-half of students in all three sectors identified "current events", and over one-third in all three sectors identified "topics relating to your major." Students surveyed also wrote in "other" responses to the question. These frequently included fictional or literary stories, cross cultural issues, and controversial topics. Most of the "other" responses, however, widely differed, and suggest content that might appear in popular general topic magazines. When interviewed, mastery students also suggested cross-cultural and controversial issues, as well as topics related to their majors such as business, accounting, computer programming, electronics, engineering, and controversial medical issues. They also mentioned general topic areas such as health, sports, nutrition, and relationships.

Faculty Perceptions: Although some teachers interviewed commented that students enjoy writing about personal experiences, one UC teacher explained that students feel personal experiences is a more appropriate topic for lower-level ESL courses. Interviewed teachers also commented that students are overdosed on cultural topics that compare their own culture to American culture and suggested topics that students have opinions about, for example, changing roles since immigration, independence and family responsibility, and how their culture views men crying.

Topic Preferences (continued)

STUDENT SURVEY: For writing assignments and exercises, which topics are most interesting to you? You can circle more than one answer.

	COLLEGE SEGMENTS						TOTAL	
	COMMUNITY COLLEGES		CAL STATE UNIVERSITIES		UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.			
AMERICAN CULTURE	132	27%	78	22%	21	17%	229	24%
CIVICS AND GOVERMENT	42	9%	34	10%	9	7%	85	9%
AMERICAN HISTORY	58	12%	32	9%	12	10%	102	11%
ART	55	14%	29	8%	8	6%	92	10%
MUSIC	56	11%	43	13%	10	8%	109	11%
PERSONAL EXPERIENCES	323	66%	240	70%	97	77%	660	69%
POPULAR SCIENCE	65	13%	54	16%	23	18%	142	15%
CURRENT EVENTS	210	43%	159	46%	57	45%	426	44%
TOPICS RELATED TO MAJOR	171	35%	111	32%	41	33%	323	34%
OTHER	34	7%	22	6%	11	9%	67	7%
TOTAL	490	100%	342	100%	126	100%	958	100%

PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL VALID COLUMN RESPONDENTS

TOPIC PREFERENCES

MASTERY STUDENT INTERVIEW: For writing assignments and exercises, which topics are most interesting to you? Why?

	COMMUNITY COLLEGE	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
American Culture	Comparing my culture with American culture. American customs	Not familiar enough.	Comparing American with Chinese traditions. The development of American culture, classes of people, controversial subjects. Teenagers; life styles of different cultures and comparisons.
Civics and Government	It's important to understand the government. Too hard--too many terms I don't know.		
American History	How history affects American culture.	I already took history.	
Art	Art history and survey of periods.		In general. Art history and contemporary art.
Music	Romantic, popular music soft rock.	Western	Music appreciation.
Personal Experiences	Much more interesting to write about this--readers are interested too. I love writing about personal experiences.		Stories, anecdotes.
Popular Science	Biology, microbiology, genetics.		
Current Events	I read a lot, so this is interesting to me. Yes, to keep informed.		Sometimes interesting, but sometimes boring.
Topics Related to Your Major	Business communications Business administration; management; payroll; accounting Computer programming Electronics	accounting accounting international business engineering	Medical ethics; controversies in the medical field.
Other	Life here in America--how to adapt yourself to this new country, and opportunities here. How special the U.S. is.	People, behavior, relationships, and the lives of important people like the president. What it's like to be a student from another country; how you feel in the school environment; relationships with other people. Health, diet, nutrition; family life and relationships between the family and outside friends. Nutrition, sports, and the culture of Hong Kong. Relationships: student and school; student and society, and family relationships.	Comparing Korean traditions with American traditions. Romance and fantasy. Problems is society--drugs, alcohol, abortion, poverty, homeless people. These are easy to write about because they are on the news. For pure pleasure--mysteries, biographies of famous people, English lit, legends and myths. Psychology and general ed., as long as it's not math.

TOPIC PREFERENCES

FACULTY SURVEY: For writing assignments and exercises, which topics are most interesting to your students?

	Community College	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
American Culture	-Every text already has this--they overdosed. -They enjoy reading about this.	-Overdone--but cross-cultural is good. -OK, as long as it's not on differences between their own and American cultural norms that are difficult to get used to, becoming your own person, sex role differences, and changing roles since immigration, issues around competition (since where they came from is more cooperative), independence and family responsibility.	-Cross-cultural comparisons, but not in relation to their own, because this singles them out too much. Better to do issues they'd have certain views on because of their own cultures. For example, whether it's OK to marry someone outside your own culture, or how their culture views men crying.
Civics & Government	-If it's topic--"Presidential Election," for example. -If given information.	-No. -No.	-Boring to them. -No.
American History	-Highlights, like slavery; juicier topics. -If give information.	-No. -No.	-Boring to them. -No.
Art	-Some would like, not others. -If given information.	-No. -No.	-No. -No.
Music	-Some would like, not others.	-If it's their major. -Yes--soft rock.	-Not the majority, but some. -No.
Personal Experiences	-Yes. -Yes.	-Could have trouble here because they're not used to expressing their feelings, or they don't see that their own experiences are important. They feel that what the teacher says is important. -Yes--parents limit their experiences, but it's good to write about issues on work, values clarification, career issues like getting along with co-workers.	-They love this. Anytime they can incorporate their own experiences, it's easy for them. But they don't consider this appropriate for their level. Previous course, junior colleges, and state universities do lots of writing on this. -Definitely.
Popular Science	-For some. -No.	-No. -No, unless it's stemming from medicine, like AIDS or other current issues--covering them in non-threatening ways.	-Computer age, age of technology, etc. -No.

TOPIC PREFERENCES

FACULTY SURVEY: For writing assignments and exercises, which topics are most interesting to your students?

Current Events	-Yes. -Yes.	-Yes, because it's different--what's going on in the news in all sorts of fields--for example, science and sociology. -No--they may not have a sense of responsibility about the larger community or social issues; for example, one Asian ethnic group may not care about another Asian ethnic group.	-Yes, they enjoy this as long as it's topical, or things they can take a stand on like abortion, or whether or not the space program should be continued. -Yes, especially if controversial, like nuclear energy and drugs.
Topics Related to Their Major	-No--they may not be deep enough into their major or their major(?) -No.	-No. -This is hard because there are so many different majors. Unless you choose a trendy topic within an area--for example, for computers, the pros and cons of video games.	-Yes. -Yes.
Other	-When the reading is interesting, this sparks an interest in writing. For example, a very interesting reading--"Whether or not we should be secretive about death." -Maybe literature.	-Cross-cultural topics. -Health--many do not have contact with the mainstream culture and have responsibilities for the families' health and medical appointments, etc. They also have a tendency to lack enough sleep, and their eating habits are very poor. They're very interested in sleep and stress reduction. They could examine their own diets. Their concept of health from their own country may have been to simply get something to eat. -Movies--finding different reviews on a film and comparing them. -Hobbies--girls read Chinese "Tiger Beat" type magazines. -They go bowling, and majority go to Christian churches (Asians).	-General ed would be great, like psychology. -"The Asian Experience"--experiences of racial discrimination, whether or not to integrate, the search for identity. Controversial issues--abortion, surrogate motherhood. Abstract sociological concepts. Using video to take them through the process of synthesizing different points of view from various sources, and using a rhetorical mode such as compare and contrast or a vehicle to write about what interests them.

Goal 6: Gather course objectives, materials, and syllabi from current ESL courses.

TARGET COURSE SURVEY

Summary The project team requested the following materials from each of the nineteen participating institutions

- Course description
- Course objectives
- Grading rubrics
- Course outline/syllabus
- Course materials (textbook titles, etc.)

During the design phase, the project team will use these materials as resources for the design and development of the video-based materials.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Advisory Committee on English as a Second Language. 1984. "Report to the Chancellor on The Survey of Programs of Instruction in English as a Second Language." California: The California State University.

Blair, R. (ed.). 1982. Innovative Approaches to Language Teaching. Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers.

Brand, D. "The New Whiz Kids." Time, August 31, 1987.

Brumfit, D. J. and Johnson, K. (eds.). 1979. The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching. London: Oxford University Press.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. (1983). Promises to Keep: Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities. Sacramento: Author.

Canale, M. and Swain, M. 1980. "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing." Applied Linguistics 1.1:1-47.

Celce-Murcia, M. (1987). "Differences in English and ESL Instruction." Paper presented at Santa Monica Symposium: ESL at the Crossroads.

Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education. 1987. The Master Plan Renewed: Unity, Equity, Quality, and Efficiency in California Postsecondary Education. Sacramento: Author.

CETaLL News. 1987. "Man and the Media II: Media and Cross-Cultural Communication in Foreign Language Learning." System 15.1:119-123.

Dulay, H., Burt, M., and Krashen, S. 1982. Language Two. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fein, D. (1980). A Comparison of English and ESL Compositions. Unpublished master's thesis, University of California at Los Angeles.

Freedman, A., Pringle, I., and Yalden, J. (eds.). 1983. Learning to Write: First Language/Second Language. London: Longman.

Judd, E. 1981. "Language Policy, Curriculum Development, and TESOL Instruction: A Search for Compatibility." TESOL Quarterly 15.1:59-66.

Kayfetz, J. 1987. "Whose Move Is It? Discourse Patterns and the Formal Presentation in the Physical Sciences." Faculty Career Development Award Proposal.

_____. 1982. "Natural Sequences in Speech and Writing in Adult Second Language Acquisition." System 10:145-157.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Kozma, R. 1986. "Implications of Instructional Psychology for the Design of Educational Television." ECTJ 34.1:11-19.

Krashen, S. 1984. Writing: Research, Theory, and Applications. Oxford: Pergamon Institute of English.

_____. 1982. Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

_____. 1981. "Effective Second Language Acquisition: Insights from Research." The Second Language Classroom: Directions for the 1980's. New York: Oxford University Press.

_____. and Terrell, T. 1983. The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom. Hayward, Cal.: Alemany Press.

Littlewood, W. 1981. Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lonergan, J. 1984. Video in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Munby, J. 1987. Communicative Syllabus Design: A Sociolinguistic Model for Defining the Content of Purpose-Specific Language Programmes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oller, J., Jr. and Richard-Amato, P. 1983. Methods That Work: A Smorgasbord of Ideas for Language Teachers. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Otto, R. and Otheguy, R. 1979. "Bilingual Education Goes to College: A Look at Program Objectives in Two Community Colleges." TESOL Quaraterly 13.2:161-170.

Petersen, A., and Cepeda, R. (1985). English as a Second Language: Statement of Findings and Policy Recommendations. Staff Presentation to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

Raimes, A. 1983. Techniques in Teaching Writing. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reid, J. 1987. "The Learning Style Preferences of ESL Students." TESOL Quarterly 21.1:87-111.

Ross, S., Burke, K., Callen, J., Eskey, D., and McKay, J. "Expectations and Evaluations of the Second Languaage Student: Matters of Articulation in California Education." A report to the English Liaison Committee of the Articulation Conference.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Stern, H. 1983. Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stevick, E. W. 1976. Memory, Meaning, and Method. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Widdowson, H. 1978. Teaching Language as Communication. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilkins, D. A. 1976. Notional Syllabuses: A Taxonomy and Its Relevance to Foreign Language Curriculum Development. London: Oxford University Press.

Yalden, J. 1983. The Communicative Syllabus: Evolution, Design and Implementation. New York: Pergamon Institute of English.

Zamel, V. 1983. "The Composing Processes of Advanced ESL Students: Six Case Studies." TESOL Quarterly 17.2:165-187.

_____. 1980. "Re-evaluating Sentence-Combining Practice." TESOL Quarterly 14.1:81-90.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges AUG 11 1989